

Summary of the
**constituent meeting of the
DBLP Advisory Board**

held on November 19th, 2011,
in Saarbrücken, Germany



SCHLOSS DAGSTUHL
Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik

In attendance:

- Andreas Butz (LMU Munich)
- Dietmar Saupe (Univ. of Konstanz)
- Hannah Bast (Univ. of Freiburg)
- Hans-Peter Lenhof (Saarland Univ.)
- Jürgen Teich (Univ. of Erlangen-Nuremberg)
- Marc Herbstritt (Schloss Dagstuhl LZI)
- Marcel R. Ackermann (Schloss Dagstuhl LZI, DBLP)
- Michael Ley (Univ. of Trier, DBLP)
- Mila Majster-Cederbaum (Univ. of Mannheim)
- Oliver Günther (Humboldt Univ. of Berlin)
- Oliver Hoffmann (Schloss Dagstuhl LZI, DBLP)
- Otto Spaniol (RWTH Aachen)
- Reinhard Wilhelm (Schloss Dagstuhl LZI, Saarland Univ.)
- Rüdiger Reischuk (Univ. of Lübeck)

Absent (excused):

- Rüdiger Dillmann (Karlsruhe Inst. of Tech.)

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Presentation „DBLP@Dagstuhl“
3. Discussion
4. Rules of procedure
5. Election of a speaker
6. Appointment of next meeting

Meeting begins: 10:00 a.m.

Item 1: Introduction

Reinhard Wilhelm welcomes the board members and opens the meeting. The DBLP Advisory Board consists of the following members (area of expertise given in brackets):

- Andreas Butz (Media Informatics and Human-Machine-Interaction)
- Dietmar Saupe (Multimedia Signal Processing)
- Hannah Bast (Algorithms and Data Structures)
- Hans-Peter Lenhof (Bioinformatics)
- Jürgen Teich (Hardware-Software-Codesign)
- Mila Majster-Cederbaum (Complex Systems)
- Oliver Günther (Information Systems)
- Otto Spaniol (Communication and Distributed Systems)
- Rüdiger Dillmann (Humanoids and Intelligence Systems)
- Rüdiger Reischuk (Theoretical Computer Science)

Item 2: Presentation „DBLP@Dagstuhl“

Michael Ley gives a short talk on the history and the status quo of DBLP. The slides of this talk are attached as auxiliary file (in German only).

Item 3: Discussion

The following aspects are discussed.

- *DBLP data policy*: Michael Ley reports that currently the decision to include a conference/journal series („streams“) is made based on his experience („gut feeling“). The CAPES (<http://www.capes.gov.br/>) and the CORE (<http://core.edu.au/>) rankings are taken into account. Efforts are made to prioritize high-quality streams over low-quality streams. Also, the quality of the meta data is taken into account (in terms of correctness, completeness, workload of acquisition). Records are removed from DBLP only on very rare occasions.

It is discussed whether the open-data policy of DBLP is a good idea since it allows for the development of competing systems that might split the community. Michael Ley reports that there are already a number of external projects (e.g., CompleteSearch, FacetedSearch, Free search, PubZone) that enrich the community and do not pose a threat to DBLP.

The members of the board are encouraged to check for the DBLP coverage of the top-quality journals and conference series in their respective areas of expertise.

- *Publication culture in computer science*: It is discussed that in computer science, conferences have a much higher standing than in other disciplines. Also, the publishing landscape is rather heterogeneous.

It is discussed how informal publications like preprints or informal workshop talks can be separated from formal publications. It is noted that indexing an informal publication in DBLP may cause problems with the republication policies of conferences and journals.

- *Bibliometric Rankings*: Rüdiger Reischuk reports on the efforts of the Fakultätentag Informatik to establish a reliable data source for bibliometric rankings in computer science. Although this might be a controversial subject, bibliometric rankings would take place with or without the support of the research community. The community should steer this process into the right direction. The Fakultätentag Informatik found in DBLP the most reliable source of bibliographic

data available.

Consensus is reached that any decreed bibliometric ranking will not be accepted by the research community. It is suggested that a community survey could be used to develop a ranking. Possible target groups could be the members of the Fakultätentag Informatik, the special interest groups of the Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V. (GI), the reviewers of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), or the seminars at Schloss Dagstuhl LZI. It is noted that such a survey should also include organizations outside Germany.

Rüdiger Reischuk notes that the Fakultätentag Informatik has reservations against the use of numerical scales to rank publications. A ranking scheme using categories (e.g., „A-B-C“) is preferred. It is noted that commercial providers of bibliometric data are criticized because of their intransparent procedures. The board agrees that the determination of any bibliometric data in DBLP should be transparent right from the start.

Consensus is reached that bibliographic data should be acquired as soon as possible in a pragmatic way, even if this means that the results will be restricted to the German point of view. The collected data could be refined and improved in the future.

- *Scope:* It is discussed how interdisciplinary fields such as bioinformatics fit into DBLP. Consensus is reached that a complete coverage of related fields like Biology is infeasible. However, a small selection of high-quality streams might be sufficient. In the case of bioinformatics PubMed (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/>) plays an important role and could be a helpful resource.
- *Unique selling point of DBLP:* The question is raised where DBLP's unique selling point lies when compared to similar services like Google Scholar. It is mentioned that other services are just beginning to establish author pages while they are already well established in DBLP. Furthermore, the involvement of the research community is also an advantage of DBLP.

Michael Ley reports that the philosophy of DBLP is data-centric while other service providers focus on algorithms. It is noted that the (to a large degree) manual data acquisition lead to a very high data quality, although at the cost of a higher workload.

It is mentioned that publishers usually do not see DBLP as a competitor to their digital libraries. Rather, they understand DBLP as a popular pointer to their digital libraries. Michael Ley reports that Springer and IEEE Xplore provide DBLP with the meta data for their latest publications on a regular basis.

- *Perspectives and further development of DBLP:* It is suggested that DBLP should also include information on abstracts and citations of papers. Such information could be helpful in bibliometric analyses. It is noted that abstracts are covered by copyright regulations and require permission to be republished. Also, collecting information on the (co-)citations of papers is possible but requires a larger team.

Actions:

- The board members agree to check for DBLP coverage of the top-quality journals and conference series in their respective areas of expertise. If a high-quality stream is missing, a short notice can be sent to the DBLP team.
- Four subcommittees dedicated to different topics are formed. The objective of the subcommittees is to continue the discussion (online) after the meeting adjourns, and to prepare a small presentation on their subject for the next meeting.
 - Publications: M. Majster-Cederbaum, R. Wilhelm
 - Bibliometrics: R. Reischuk, J. Teich
 - Perspectives: O. Spaniol, H. Bast, A. Butz, O. Günther, M. Herbstritt
 - Scope: H.-P. Lenhof, D. Saupe

Item 4: Rules of procedure

The draft rules of procedure are discussed. It is mentioned that paragraph 2 (Membership) is very vague. It is suggested that existing institutions like the special interest groups of the Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V. (GI) could be used to elect board members.

Actions:

- The board passes the draft rules of procedure without changes. The rules of procedure are attached as auxiliary file.
- The board asks Schloss Dagstuhl LZI to propose changes to paragraph 2 (Membership) for the next meeting.

Item 5: Election of a speaker

Hannah Bast is nominated as the speaker of the DBLP Advisory Board.

Actions:

- Hannah Bast is elected as the speaker of the DBLP Advisory Board.

Item 6: Appointment of next meeting

The next meeting will take place on March 2nd, 2012, 2:00 p.m. in Mannheim, Germany. Mila Majster-Cederbaum volunteered to arrange an appropriate meeting room; this is highly appreciated by the participants.

Meeting adjourns: 1:30 p.m.

Meeting notes: Marcel R. Ackermann, Trier, Germany, November 23rd, 2011