NOPE 2015

2015 Workshop for Negative Outcomes, Post-mortems, and Experiences

Co-Located with the 48th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture
Waikiki, Hawaii, December 5–6, 2015
www.nope.pub

Organizers

David Brooks
Svilen Kanev
Robert Adolf
Brandon Reagen

Harvard University

Program Comittee

TBD

Important Dates

Submission deadline
TBD

Author notification
TBD

Camera-ready version
TBD

Our community has a bias for publishing "good results", i.e. results that improve the current state of the art in one of the major metrics. All projects start out with excitement and promise. Sometimes, however, initial progress gives way to gridlock. Some encounter unexpected limitations, uncover hidden complexity, or are exposed as fundamentally infeasible. When a researcher is left holding a failed project, they are typically faced with two choices: (i) try to spin it off in a positive way; or (ii) not publish. The former case is just unnecessary wordsmithing that is often transparent to reviewers and irritating to readers. The latter can be even more toxic to the community: not knowing that a good-sounding idea is "bad" can send many researchers independently on dead-end paths. NOPE offers a third option: presenting "bad results" in all their splendor, and focusing on lessons learned.

We invite submissions from all sub-areas of computer architecture. Submissions should focus on analyzing the reasons for failure, especially in light of underlying assumptions. Submissions based on opinion, speculation, and non-fundamental circumstances ("there was a bug in the simulator") are not encouraged as they do not provide concrete evidence as to whether an idea is bad. Moreover, submissions which attempt to debunk previous work will not be considered- the purpose of NOPE is to share first-hand experiences of how and why the idea failed, making sure the community does not leep re-inventing a broken wheel.

Topics of interest include:

- Thorough evaluations of failed projects which uncover and characterize the root cause.
- Papers which describe both positive and negative results, with an emphasis on the underlying reasons behind why some succeeded and other failed.
- Cradle-to-grave examination of completed projects, specifically to dissect dead-ends and unworkable solutions encountered along the way.
- Design space explorations or comprehensive experiments which suggest a particular technique is unlikely to work under a realistic set of assumptions.
- Research which uncovers fundamental limitations in scalability, performance, accuracy, or other quantifiable metrics.
- Any research which serves to share the lessons of failure to the broader community, such that we can avoid repeating them in the future.