4602 Committee
Michael Winikoff (chair), Eneko Aguirre, Noa Agmon, Christian Blum, Longbing Cao, Sergio Grecco,
Reza Haffari

Decision
Conference to be ranked as A*

Justification

ICAPS was on the review list. They submitted to retain an A* rank.

The various indicators were somewhat mixed. On the one hand, there are clearly strong people
involved in the conference (both on the PC and publishing and attending), and the conference is a
venue of choice for people in the area (see below). On the other hand, the conference was
considered by some somewhat small for an A*, and its citation percentiles were weak. Additional
information was provided by the submitters making the case that ICAPS had high quality reviewing.

The area leaders analysis was, unfortunately, not constructed in an objective way, since, in
addition to a google scholar search, various people were added on an ad hoc basis. A new analysis
was therefore done. This showed ICAPS as being the top venue of choice for people in automated
planning:

1. International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS)
This venue was published at 65 times by 15 of 19 individuals in the last 5+ years.

2. AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)
This venue was published at 57 times by 15 of 19 individuals in the last 5+ years.

So, overall, ICAPS is clearly the top conference for AI planning.

Counter-indicators that were considered and ultimately discounted:

- Somewhat weak h5=32 - smaller venues are known to be disadvantaged on this metric

- Citation centiles (which should not be affected by size): The weaker citations could perhaps
be explained by the fact that larger AI conferences include many machine learning papers, and
that these get substantially more citations than other areas.