

# **WG2: membership**

**WG2: Pietro Antinoli, Doug Higinbotham, PAS**

# Scope of this discussion

- We are writing language for the EPIC charter
- Our discussions, however, ranged into policy, which we have deliberately decided to scale back to allow for flexibility later
- Policies can and will evolve (and we had a lot of interesting discussions within WG2 on this!) but there is no need to spell it out now
- So while we feel some of the details are important for discussions up front, we feel the urgency of the charter itself lends itself to a more minimal approach

# Questions from Olga (thanks!)

- **By group / by individual?**
- **“Good standing” (or equivalent) status?**
- **Rights and responsibilities**
- **Admission/dismissal of groups/individuals.**
- **Authorship status**

# Group vs individual

- **Groups are admitted into the collaboration and typically require at least 2 PhD-level scientists, with one serving as Institute Representative (IR)**
- **We felt that while individuals should satisfy minimum requirements, the standing of all members can be affected by the status of the group**
  - Institution-level commitments and responsibilities should be defined up front
  - Needs a consistent way of managing expectations from the EPIC side as the group size/composition evolves
- **Need consistent policy to include engineers, technicians, etc. as members**
  - Membership policy could be different before CD4, including all meaningful contributions from technical staff, and then further inclusion could be handled in particular cases
  - DH: Hall B gives limited memberships - they don't vote even if they can be on papers
- **How do we handle groups of widely different sizes (e.g. 60+ for labs vs. 2+ for small university groups)**
  - e.g. solicit multiple IRs per group depending on size, with a max (e.g. 3)
    - *This might also smooth out dynamics within very large institutions*
  - Require institutions to have at least 3 PhD-level scientists
    - *Very small groups could group together as clusters, or align with a larger group*

# “Good standing”

- **“Good standing” (GS) is typically a precondition to signing papers as an author (exceptions are mentioned below)**
  - Applies to individuals but also can be defined to apply to entire groups
- **Maintenance of good standing**
  - Groups are reviewed yearly by EPIC management
  - Maintained by contributing to service work, shifts, etc. (does physics work count?)
- **Details should be left to policy document**
  - Should be a membership board to maintain these policies and revise them on a regular basis, proposing modifications to the IB
- **Participation (both attendance AND voting) on IB matters should be part of the group’s good standing**
  - perhaps more relevant to WG5

# Rights and responsibilities

- **Should define benefits of membership schematically in the charter, and leave details to policy**
- **Should consider defining multiple levels, which define greater levels of privilege within the collaboration**
  - e.g. member vs. author, and even gradations of members to accommodate technical collaborator
- **Privileges**
  - access to email lists
  - access to data
  - giving talks on behalf of ePIC
  - acting as group convenors, subproject leaders, etc.
- **Evolution from member to author**
  - PA: In ALICE, members are immediate authors, service contributions contributed over time.
  - PS: In ATLAS, members are required to qualify over a ~year, by contributing service (non-physics) work

# Admission/dismissal to/from EPIC

- **Groups are admitted by a 2/3 (or 50%) majority of votes cast by IB, after a proposal to the management, reviewed ahead of IB meeting**
  - Should include planned contributions to detector construction/operation/upgrade as well as physics plans
  - Do institutions already working on EPIC grandparent in, or do we need such a plan from everyone?
- **Admission proposal should always include a team leader who will serve as IR on the IB**
- **Groups can leave the collaboration anytime - can you enforce “costs” (e.g. in MOU) for leaving work unfinished?**
  - Seems unlikely, but could be part of admission proposal
- **Groups can be asked to leave (or be “suspended”) at the discretion of EPIC management.**
  - Typically based on inability to fulfill responsibilities to EPIC (based on the periodic review of the group activities).
  - IB endorses each suspension by a 2/3 majority vote

# Authorship status

- **We think this should be left to the eventual publication committee (e.g. the ATHENA “editorial board”), but since this isn’t part of original set of groups, WG2 could provide some guidance**
- **Minimal requirement is that an author should be a member in good standing (MGS)**
- **However, exceptions can be defined**
  - people to contributed substantially to the publication
  - collaborators who left EPIC less than a year ago
  - non-PhD students or even non-members who contributed substantially to an paper
- **Approval of exceptions is made by the spokesperson and publication committee.**
- **Very important: what about members who were asked to leave (for “cause”, e.g. a DEI violation)**
  - We agreed that they lose it immediately