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Rationale

- We have a unique opportunity to explore an alternative sponsorship mechanism
- Independent foundation drawn from our community, “clean sheet” design
  - Financial and institutional advantages
- Inspired by: NIPS, AAAI, USENIX, etc.
- CVPR11 left a surplus which allows us to bootstrap this process smoothly
Summary of advantages

• Lightweight organization that can easily adapt to our community’s unique needs
• Impose appropriate (minimal) overhead
  – Financially: significantly more efficient
  – Procedurally: approvals only needed from members of the vision community
• Ensure leverage for future CVPR/ICCV’s
How would this work?

• CVF is an independent non-profit
• An individual CVPR/ICCV can decide to use CVF as a co-sponsor, in whole or in part
  – Technical or financial
• CVPR/ICCV are chosen just as always
• CVF uses surplus from previous conferences to provide initial loan for current one
• CVPR13 test case, using CVPR11 surplus
Structural advantages

• CVF brings together the journal (TPAMI) and the conferences (CVPR/ICCV) in a natural way
  – Currently the relationship with TPAMI will be purely informal via shared leadership
• CVF has flexibility to deal with industrial opportunities that may arise
• Ultimately, CVF may be able to fund anything that the community thinks it should
Financial advantages

• External sponsorship of CVPR & ICCV has historically been very expensive

• Just in the period 2004-2010, CVPR & ICCV send ~ $1.6M to IEEE-CS
  – Which sent ~$200K to PAMITC and kept the rest
  – IEEE membership fees are even larger

• Contribution has not been commensurate with cost
  – See appendix of Forsyth committee report
  – Particularly bad since 2007
Procedural advantages

• CVPR/ICCV are restricted by the sponsor
  – Any sponsor want to ensure it makes money
• IEEE-CS policies are enforced by people who do not come from the our community
• This has often obstructed the conference organizers in the past (see Forsyth appendix)
  – Ex: CVPR09 was not allowed to spend its money on travel grants for students or for social events
  – Ex: CVPR11 was told “Overspending on Social Functions at the last minute indicates serious problems with the management of this conference”
CVF generalizes CVPR11

• CVPR11 problems with IEEE-CS led to a co-sponsored conference with UCCS (Boult)
• Many advantages: lower registration fees, less micromanagement, surplus available to community under our control
• Model was designed at the last minute under severe time pressure to run AC meeting
  – We have a chance to do this “right”
CVF structure

- Board of directors (CVPR11 & CVPR13 GC’s, plus RDZ’s wife who is an attorney)
- Board is self-selecting and self-accountable
  - Just like NIPS, but CVF doesn’t pick organizers
- Bylaws on web page shortly
- Membership includes all CVPR11 attendees
  - We expect this will provide member-rate registration at CVPR13
  - Members will be consulted but don’t vote