

IFIP Author Code of Conduct

A1. Analysis

A1.1 The modern scientific edifice rests on the publication system. The publication system rests on a sound, honest and sustainable refereeing process. The refereeing process rests on ethical behavior by the authors of submitted papers as well as by the referees themselves.

A1.2 Plagiarism (the inclusion of other people's work without acknowledgment, with or without permission) is a form of fraud.

A1.3 Self-plagiarism (the multiple publication of the same material without explicit acknowledgment) fuels publication inflation with no benefit for the community and distorts the researcher evaluation process.

A1.4 Multiple submission of the same or essentially the same material may not result in self-plagiarism (if all but one versions are withdrawn in case of multiple acceptance) but puts the entire scientific edifice at risk by creating referee overload and devaluing the work of referees.

A1.5 It is the duty of IFIP, as the international information processing society, to lead in defining and enforcing ethical author practices.

A1.6 Violators of the rules shall be sanctioned. All sanctions shall be applied through due process, including the right for defendants to present their case and to be considered innocent until proven guilty.

A2. Scope

A2.1 The present Code does not innovate but codifies widely accepted Best Practices of the scientific ITC community, applying them to IFIP-related venues.

A2.2 The present Code shall govern submission to and publication in all IFIP-organized venues such as journals, conferences, symposia and workshops. Every venue shall make authors and prospective authors aware of the Code as part of standard submission information (in particular on the venue's Web site).

A2.3 Individual publication venues may override specific aspects of the present Code. Any such changes shall be part of submission information provided per A2.2. They shall be compatible with the spirit of the present Code, in particular the principles of soundness, honesty and sustainability (A1.1).

A2.4 The present Code shall govern all venues co-organized by IFIP and other organizations. It is the responsibility of the organizers of such venues to identify

any conflicts with rules of other organizations involved, and to resolve them through specific overriding rules per A2.3.

A2.5 Some institutions define rules on publications authored by their staff members, regarding for example who should be listed as an author. It is the responsibility of authors, when submitting work to IFIP-sponsored venues, to follow both their institutions' rules and the present Code, and to seek advice from venue organizers in case of any perceived conflict.

A2.6 The natural complement to ethical author behavior is ethical referee behavior. A companion document describes the IFIP Referee Code of Conduct.

A3. Rules

A3.1 Plagiarism (per A1.2) is unacceptable. Any inclusion of other people's work, even if not a literal quotation, shall (in addition to observing any applicable copyright and intellectual property regulation) be acknowledged explicitly.

A3.2 Self-plagiarism (per A1.3) is unacceptable.
The following cases shall *not* be considered self-plagiarism:

- A3.2.1 Republication of part or all of a contribution in a new context (such as a conference paper extended into a journal article), *provided* it observes the following conditions: the older publication is explicitly acknowledged in the newer one; *and* the authors explicitly inform the organizers of the newer venue, at the time of submission, of the existence and content of the older one.
- A3.2.2 Reuse of individual sentences or paragraphs from an older publication, collectively amounting to a small proportion of a newer publication (typically no more than 20%).

A3.3 Multiple submission (A1.4) is unacceptable.
The following shall *not* be considered multiple submission:

- A.3.3.1 Submission of some of the same results to venues of a different nature and different deadlines, *provided* the authors explicitly inform the organizers of *both* venues, at the time of submission, of the existence of the other submission.
- A.3.3.2 Submission of the same or substantially the same material for publication in different languages, *provided* the authors explicitly inform the organizers of *both* venues, at the time of submission, of the existence of the other submission.

- A.3.3.3 Submitting a contribution, changed or not, to a new venue *after* another venue has rejected its submission.

A3.4 Authors shall acknowledge previous work and, when describing it (including for the purpose of pointing out limitations and possible improvements), represent its contribution fairly and accurately.

A3.5 If a venue asks submitters to mention cases of possible conflict of interest in a list of potential reviewers, the response shall include all genuine cases (as per the definition of “conflict of interest” in the Referee Code of Conduct), and genuine cases only.

4. Responsibilities

A4.1 It is the responsibility of the organizers of every IFIP-sponsored venue (such as a conference chair, program chair, multi-author book editor, journal editor) to enforce this Code, including making sure that members of program committees and editorial boards are on the alert for possible violations.

A4.2 It is the responsibility of the entire IFIP community to make the present Code widely known by potential authors.

A4.3 It is the special responsibility of senior leaders and scientists in the IFIP community to educate junior potential contributors to the rules of ethical submission, as reflected in the present Code.

A5. Sanctions

A5.1 It is the responsibility of organizers, when violations of the present Code are suspected, to handle them promptly, efficiently and in collaboration with interested parties (including referees, and organizers of other affected publication venues), to maintain fairness to all persons involved, and when appropriate to devise and apply appropriate sanctions.

A5.2 Before applying any sanction, organizers shall give the suspected violators an opportunity to explain their alleged behavior and to correct any unfounded accusation.

A5.3 Organizers shall ensure that any sanction is commensurate with the gravity of the violation. They shall distinguish between inadvertent and conscious violations, and between junior and experienced violators. First-time violators showing commitment to stay away from further violations shall not be subjected to sanctions that would damage their reputations or careers.

A5.4 Sanctions may include one of more of:

- Private reprimand to violators.

- Rejection of submissions on grounds of principle, regardless of content. (In case of rejection because of multiple submission, such a sanction shall be applied by all affected venues.)
- If the affected contributions have been published, removal from digital libraries.
- Notification of all affected parties, such as program committees, editorial boards and steering committees of affected venues.
- Ban on submitting to the corresponding venue or venues for a set period (such as a few years).
- Exclusion for a set period from IFIP activities such as working groups and conferences.