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Optimizing Throughput by Modified IPv6 Headers

Gruschenka Steven and Uwe Fellensik and Edwin Steinblokker
University of Köln-Kalk
Robert Bosch Strasse 5
D-59769 Köln
e-mail: {steven,fellensick,steinblocker}@uni-kk.ge

Abstract—Modifying the header information in IPv6 introduces various possibilities for optimization. Here, we show a mechanism for enhancing the routing process which leads to higher throughput, which is fundamental for high-speed networks. We achieve this goal by extending the IPv6 header by additional routing information. Our routing algorithm “JUPP” uses this information for optimal delivery of messages. By prioritizing some messages we can guarantee throughput needs that is required for some applications, such as VoIP or IPTV. Our simulations showed that the bandwidth loss introduced by the protocol is very low.

1. INTRODUCTION

The implications of interposable IPv6 models have been far-reaching and efficient. Although experimental results at first glance seem sufficient, it is contradicted by existing work in the field. An unproven challenge remains in bandwidth improvements and especially the study of congestion when multiple paths are used. Contrarily, the algorithms based on IPv6 header modifications alone can fulfill the need for congestion control and bandwidth optimization at the same time.

Li runs in O(n!) time. Similarly, Figure III plots the basic structure of JUPP. Rather than requesting RAID, our approach chooses to learn 802.11b. Similarly, we executed a minute-long trace demonstrating that our model is not feasible. This seems to hold in most cases. Therefore, the design that Esteem uses is unfounded.

Figures 1 shows the basic IPv6 protocol. Figure 2 shows the IPv6 after modification for JUPP. Our implementation of our method is peer-to-peer, perfect, and optimal. Congestion bits help to manage congestion in an easy way: We count the number of dropped packets at the respective hop and add it to an incremented fill up stack. Once, a threshold is reached, the algorithm stops. Similarly, since our application improves the producer-consumer problem, programming the hacked operating system was relatively straightforward. One cannot imagine other methods to the implementation that would have made implementing it much simpler.

III. MODEL

Our research is principled. Rather than managing the looka-
III. Model

Our research is principled. Rather than managing the lookaside buffer, JUPP chooses to analyze 802.11 mesh networks. This may or may not actually hold in reality. Furthermore, JUPP does not require such an extensive allowance to run correctly, but it doesn’t hurt. Any essential analysis of event-driven configurations will clearly require that the infamous distributed algorithm for the refinement of local-area networks by C. Hoare et al. runs in $\Omega(n)$ time; our method is no different. Although statisticians mostly assume the exact opposite, our system depends on this property for correct behavior. We assume that agents can be made signed, “fuzzy”, and decentralized. We use our previously simulated results as a basis for all of these assumptions.
that we have not yet optimized for usability, this should be simple once we finish implementing the codebase of 25 IPv4 files. A number of prior systems have simulated “fuzzy” methodologies, either for the refinement of link-level acknowledgements or for the improvement of link-level acknowledgements. Recent work by Robin Milner et al.[5] suggests a heuristic for allowing operating systems, but does not offer an implementation. This method is more flimsy than ours. An analysis of digital-to-analog converters proposed by Brown and Wang fails to address several key issues that our application does surmount. Richard Stearns et al. [6] originally articulated the need for ubiquitous models. We plan to adopt


Dear Gruschenka Steven,

On behalf of the Program Committee, we are happy to inform you that your contribution 20097 ("Optimizing Throughput by Modified IPv6 Headers") has been accepted at ICSNC 2009.

1. For work submitted as regular papers and Work in Progress papers:

The acceptance of your paper is made with the understanding that each accepted paper will be registered and at least one author will attend the conference to present the paper (preferably with PowerPoint slides). 10-14 slide deck is perfect. Conference rooms will have computers and video projectors.

Registration: Registration starts upon receiving this notification letter. Each accepted paper must be separately registered. The registration form is available on the conference web site:

http://www.iiaria.org/conferences2009/RegistrationICSNC09.html

Note that a paper will be published on the IEEE Xplore and Conference Proceedings only after the paper is registered, i.e., the registration form is sent in the due time and successfully processed. Please fax the registration form before uploading the paper and the copyright transfer form.
Comments - Reviewer 2

• The paper is quite interesting and seems promising.
• The references are quite elaborated, but the number of recent routing literature references seems limited.
• I personally find that the paper's presentation should be improved.
  – First, there are some details, like the related work section that comes late in the paper, and a very limited conclusion.
  – The language is not always very scientific, and that
  – the authors often make claims, without an elaborated sound argumentation. (sometimes, they might be perceived as arrogant.)
Comments - Reviewer 3

• The paper proposes a new algorithm for improving throughput by modifying the IPv6 header.
• It's written in standard format and its language is good as well.
• The strength is the authors read lots of paper and other relevant materials during their work.
• However problem is not clearly stated and therefore it is difficult to validate conclusions of the results.
• The authors don't give the specific method to get the graphs which I think somekind of important.
• It is also difficult to know what are some of the figures contribution to the paper because it is not clearly explained the testing scenario.
• Some of the figures are not clearly readable
  – (e.g. fig. 4, fig. 5 and fig. 7) and some of them are not correctly referenced (figure V-B is not present).
  – Fig. 1 is broadly known and therefore unnecessary, fig. 2 has something wrong in it and fig. 3 it is not even explained anywhere.
Paper submitted to ICSNC

• Was automatically generated:
  – SClgen (http://pdos.csail.mit.edu/scigen/)
• Was accepted by “reviewers”
• Was included in IEEE Xplore
• There are many other examples of generated papers accepted by “main publishers”:
  – http://bogus-conferences.blogspot.nl/2009_04_01_archive.html
  – http://diehimmelistschoen.blogspot.com/
Even worse....

On behalf of the Program Committee, we are happy to inform you that your paper 43 ("A Statistical Method For Women That Can Help Our Sexual Education") has been accepted for publication and presentation at ICIW 2008.

This is a very good paper of A Statistical Method For Women That Can Help Our Sexual Education.

Both of the reviewers would agree that your paper A Statistical Method For Women That Can Help Our Sexual Education can be published in ICIW 2008 without any additional modification.

The IEEE Computer Society Press will publish also your paper.

Censored by for academic reasons
GESTS
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To: Aiko Pras <pras@cs.utwente.nl>
Reply-To: gests@gests.org
Your paper has been accepted to GESTS International Transactions.

Dear Author

A Happy New Year!

As a general chair of GESTS, I am happy to invite you for the acceptance of your paper to be published in the GESTS International Transactions.

The GESTS is a nonprofit academic society organized by voluntary members around the world since 2002. Every month, we publish the GESTS international transactions which are the regular paper journals on CSE and CSP, written by noble authors in more than 50 different countries.

This e-mail has been sent only to the authors who chose as a high quality paper that had been accepted as one of two parts of GESTS international transactions as follows:

-Part 1:
  Paper Number : CSE236-707
  Paper Journal: GESTS International Transactions on Computer Science
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Network statistics

• Kevin Almeroth
• http://www.cs.ucsb.edu/~almeroth/conf/stats
• All major networking conferences
Networking Conferences Statistics

This page is an attempt to gather year-over-year statistics for some of the major systems and networking conferences. For a graphical version of these stats, see Pradeep Padala's page.

For a broader range of CFPs, see Tim Moors's WWW page.

For Architecture conference stats (ISCA, Micro, HPCA, ASPLOS), see the Prichard, Scopel, Hill, Sohi, and Wood Excel File.

For Software Engineering conference stats, see Tao Xie's Stats Page.

For Database conference stats, see Peter Aper's Stats Page.

For Graphics/Interaction/Visualization conference stats, see Rob Lindeman's Stats Page.

For Computer Security conference stats, see Guofei Gu's Computer Security Conference Ranking and Statistics Page or Jianying Zhou’s Crypto and Security Conferences Ranking.

For Theory (and some Computational Biology) conference stats, see Florian Sikora's TCS page.


If you want to add information, be sure to send all of the following:
- URL of the Conference
- Papers Submitted
- Papers Accepted
- Acceptance Ratio
- Number of Parallel Tracks, and
- Number of Attendees

Send info to almeroth@cs.ucsb.edu. Note that I always send a response. If you do not receive a response, try again, your email might have been accidently filtered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>% Accepted</th>
<th>Tracks</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACNS</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>% Accepted</td>
<td>Tracks</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>% Accepted</th>
<th>Tracks</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brazilian SHINE system

• [http://shine.icomp.ufam.edu.br](http://shine.icomp.ufam.edu.br)

• Simple H-INdex estimator

• Web-based system that calculates h-indices for a specified conference, also allowing to specify a certain time window. Google scholar data provides the basis.

• Results also used to create a list
  – Single track and new conferences have no chance
AIMS - Autonomous Infrastructure, Management and Security

H-Index = 9

AIMS has 9 papers with 9 or more citations between 2001 and 2014:

1. N2N: A Layer Two Peer-to-Peer VPN
   Luca Deri, Richard Andrews
   Year: 2008. Cited by: 23

2. Evaluation of Sybil Attacks Protection Schemes in KAD
   Thibault Cholez, Isabelle Chrisment, Olivier Festor
   Year: 2009. Cited by: 18

3. Activity-Based Scheduling of IT Changes
   David Trastour, Maher Rahmouni, Claudio Bartolini
   Year: 2007. Cited by: 16

ICT-FP7 318488
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ISI - Thomson Scientific

- 1960: Institute for Scientific Information (ISI)
  - Thomson Scientific Division
  - ISI Web of Knowledge
    - Journal Citation Reports (JCR)
    - Web of Science
      - Science Citation Index (SCI)
      - Licensed to universities and research institutes
      - Access via your university
Journals included by Thomson

• Master list can be queried online
  – http://scientific.thomsonreuters.com/mjl/
  – Before a journal gets an impact factor, it should at least 3 years by included in the SCI

• Included:
  • IEEE Communications Magazine
  • International Journal of Network Management
  • Journal on Network and Service Management
Impact factor

• The impact factor is calculated over a three-year period. It can be considered as the average number of times published papers are cited up to two years after publication.

• Example
  – A = the number of times articles published in 2010-2011 were cited in indexed journals during 2012.
  – B = the number of articles published in 2010-2011.
  – Impact factor 2012 = A/B.
## Main Networking Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>ISSN</th>
<th>Total Cites</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>5 Year Impact Factor</th>
<th>articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys &amp; Tutorials</td>
<td>1553-877X</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Mag.</td>
<td>0163-6804</td>
<td>6790</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSAC</td>
<td>0733-8716</td>
<td>9754</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>0890-8044</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. Networking</td>
<td>1063-6692</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. Comm.</td>
<td>0090-6778</td>
<td>11280</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Netw.</td>
<td>1389-1286</td>
<td>4109</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Comm.</td>
<td>0140-3664</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© ISI Web of Knowledge
## Network Management Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>ISSN</th>
<th>Total Cites</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>5 Year Impact Factor</th>
<th>articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJNM</td>
<td>1055-7148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNSM</td>
<td>1064-7570</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© ISI Web of Knowledge
Impact factor ComMag

© ISI Web of Knowledge
Impact factor other Journals

IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials

IEEE-ACM TRANSACTIONS ON NETWORKING

IEEE NETWORK

COMPUTER COMMUNICATION REVIEW

© ISI Web of Knowledge
Network Management Journals

Journal of Network and Systems Management

International Journal of Network Management

© ISI Web of Knowledge
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Scopus Journal Analyzer

• See: http://www.scopus.com/source/eval.url
  • IEEE Communications Magazine
  • Journal on Network and Service Management
  • International Journal on Network Management

• Scopus has also data on conferences:
  • CNSM, IM, NOMS, AIMS, DSOM, IPOM, …
  • SIGCOMM, INFOCOM, IMC, IFIP Networking, PAM, CONEXT, …
SCOPUS Journal Analyzer
Management of the future Internet

Note: Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996. Calculations Last Updated: 08 Jun 2013

Journals In Chart

- IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management
- International Journal of Network Management
- Journal of Network and Systems Management
Management of the future Internet

Note: Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996.
Calculations Last Updated: 08 Jun 2013

Journals In Chart
Proceedings - IEEE INFOCOM
SCOPUS: SJR & SNIP

• SJR: SCImago Journal Rank is weighted by the prestige of a journal. Subject field, quality and reputation of the journal have a direct effect on the value of a citation. SJR also normalizes for differences in citation behavior between subject fields.

• SNIP: Source Normalized Impact per Paper measures contextual citation impact by weighting citations based on the total number of citations in a subject field.

• Note: measured over 4 year interval
Note: Scopus does not have complete citation information for articles published before 1996.
Calculations Last Updated: 08 Jun 2013
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Some conference ranking sites

- CORE: Computing Research and Education Association of Australasia
- SHINE: Brazilian system: based on Google Scholar citations
- Microsoft Academic search - Top-ranked Conferences in Computer Science. Ranks conferences based on citations and publications.
- CiteseerX: Estimated Venue Impact Factors. Seems outdated
## CORE Conference Portal (alpha)

### Search (?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Changed?</th>
<th>FoR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Conference on Computer Communications</td>
<td>IEEE INFOCOM</td>
<td>CORE2013</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies</td>
<td>INFOCOM</td>
<td>CORE2013</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brazilian Conference Ranking list

• Based on conference H-index.
• Uses SHINE as input.
• List ranging from A1, A2, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5
• Used in Brazil for assessing “quality”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFOCOM</td>
<td>Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVPR</td>
<td>IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCAS</td>
<td>IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGMOD</td>
<td>ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data Conference</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGCOMM</td>
<td>ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communications Conference</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWW</td>
<td>International World Wide Web Conference</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vldb</td>
<td>International Conference on Very Large Data Bases</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDD</td>
<td>ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICML</td>
<td>International Conference on Machine Learning</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGIR</td>
<td>Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research &amp; Development in Information Retrieval</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCV</td>
<td>IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSE</td>
<td>ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRA</td>
<td>IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBICOM</td>
<td>ACM International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>International Conference of the Association of Computational Linguistics</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCA</td>
<td>ACM International Symposium on Computer Architecture</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBIHOC</td>
<td>ACM Symposium of Mobile and Ad-hoc Computing</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P</td>
<td>IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy S&amp;P)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Design Automation Conference</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOC</td>
<td>ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOCOM</td>
<td>Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGCOMM</td>
<td>ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communications Conference</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBICOM</td>
<td>ACM International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBIHOC</td>
<td>ACM Symposium of Mobile and Ad-hoc Computing</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBECOM</td>
<td>IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSYS</td>
<td>ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>ACM/IEEE Conference on High Performance Networking and Computing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDI</td>
<td>Symposium on Networked Systems: Design and Implementation</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSN</td>
<td>International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICNP</td>
<td>IEEE International Conference on Network Protocols</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>IEEE International Conference on Communications</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCN</td>
<td>IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWQoS</td>
<td>International Workshop on Quality of Service</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>Passive and Active Measurement Conference</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWSN</td>
<td>European conference on Wireless Sensor Networks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS</td>
<td>IEEE/IFIP Network Operations and Management Symposium</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONEXT</td>
<td>ACM International Conference on Emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCCN</td>
<td>International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCNC</td>
<td>IEEE Wireless and Communications and Networking Conference</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IFIP/IEEE International Symposium on Integrated Network Management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSOM</td>
<td>IFIP/IEEE International Workshop on Distributed Systems: Operations and Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICIW</td>
<td>International Conference on Internet and Web Applications and Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSNC</td>
<td>International Conference on Systems and Networks Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>Autonomous Infrastructure, Management and Security</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNSM</td>
<td>International Conference on Network and Services Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brazilian Conference Ranking list

- Favors multi-track huge conferences
- New conferences have little chance
- IM & NOMS (every 2 years) have problems
  IM=32 (B1)
  NOMS=36 (B1)
  IM+NOMS=43 (A2)
- Not very reliable / outdated data:
  - Dynamic placement of virtual machines for managing sla violations, IM07: 167 -> 392
  - SNMP traffic analysis: Approaches, tools, and first results, IM07: 29 -> 51
Avoid anonymous conference ranking sites

{www | cs} conference ranking {com | org | net}

- http://www.conference-ranking.org/

Several of such lists existed in the past:

- www.cs-conference-ranking.org
- http://cs.conference-ranking.net/
Avoid anonymous conference ranking sites

- See http://www.rankingexpose.com/

Avoid Anonymous Online Conference Ranking Sites

This is a site dedicated to exposing the scheme of some online anonymous ranking sites, including cs-conference-ranking.org and conference-ranking.net (.com and .org as well). My evidence shows that these two sites are created to promote specific multi-conferences and cannot be trusted.

It seems that some institutes or researchers have begun to use their results to review applications and select conferences. My suggestion is: unless these sites disclose the people behind the ranking and disclose the methods and data for their ranking results, you should not trust them and use their results for any means. However, I do not endorse any ranking site even the above information is disclosed. Also, ranking results are always up for interpretation. This web page is created to express my personal opinion of online conference ranking, and I am not responsible of any damage to any person (or organization) because of the content in rankingexpose.com (this site). You can find my information here.

Proven facts of conference-ranking.net:
What is a good conference?

- Affiliation with ACM, IEEE and IFIP
- Well known people in the OC & TPC
- Good ranking in:
  - Conference statistics
    - acceptance & acceptance/attendees ratio
  - Google Scholar
    - Citations
  - Web of Science & Scopus
    - Impact factor
- Long term existence and track history
- Having papers that are cited by many other papers in your research area.
Conclusions

• Have a publication plan!

• Not all conferences / journals are serious

• Use info from:
  – Kevin Almeroth: Networking Conferences Statistics
  – Simple H-index Calculator
  – Web of Science
  – Scopus
Some URLs

Networking Conferences Statistics:
http://www.cs.ucsb.edu/~almeroth/conf/stats/

CORE: Australasia Ranking of ICT Conferences:
http://core.edu.au/index.php/categories/conference%20rankings/1

Simple H-Index estimator:
http://shine.icomp.ufam.edu.br/

Microsoft Academic Search:
http://academic.research.microsoft.com