Feedback to all comments received on the draft EPIC charter circulated to EPIC interim IB on 11 October 2022

Marco Radici

The current draft mentions interactions with BNL, DOE, a broader physics community, the EIC project ... but not the EIC Users Group. The future composition of the EICUG Steering Committee, as it is being drafted by the EICUG Charter Committee, will include one representative from the EPIC Collaboration. Therefore, it is necessary to mention this interaction (in the Introduction, or when describing the role of the Spokesperson(s) - sec. 6.1) and also to specify the procedure to elect this representative.

EIC user group participation is not mandatory for EPIC members. It does not seem appropriate, in our view, to formalize a relationship at the charter level, given that we don't know of any other existing Collaboration charters spelling out interactions with User Groups. While we believe the EPIC members will continue to be active in EICUG, possible forms of cooperation do not have to be in the Charter, but could certainly be part of the operational policy.

153
qualifiation => qualification
fixed

188
election election => election
fixed

376
The Election Committee solicits ... , actively seek ..., and oversee... => seeks , oversees
fixed

408
The Election Committee prepares and oversee... => oversees
fixed

Or Hen

Line 318/19 says that the spokesperson "solicit nominations and propose conveners for working groups ... " while Line 179-181 says "upon proposal by the Executive Board of major roles in ... Working Group conveners". The way I understand these two statements don't

contradict each other is that the proposed process is for the spokesperson to propose conveners to the Executive Board, while the last word on which conveners are put forward for CC endorsement is of the EB. Independently of the question if my understanding is correct or not, I think that should be make more clear.

Thank you for the comment; your understanding is correct, but we didn't find a way to further improve the text

Section 5.5 is very clear on the DEI committee appointment process: chair elected by CC and assembles a committee that is then endorsed by the CC. I think it might be good to do the same for the Talks and Publication committee so that it is clear how they will be setup.

We are generalizing this process to all the standing committees (with the exception of the Nomination Committee) and clarifying this in the text.

(not that major but still important) The document talks about "Collaboration Council Board" and "Collaboration Council leadership". I'm not sure what the 'Board' is and assume the 'leadership' refers to the chair and vice chair? In any case it would be good to clarify these terms / structures.

"Board" is removed, "leadership" – spelled out

I agree large majority should support new institutions, but what do we do when we don't have 2/3 of the institutions voting but of the ones voting a large majority supports the addition of a new institution? I think this one requires some thoughtful workaround so that we don't turn down new collaborators but because not enough people vote... (I agree if the latter happens we have a problem, but I'd be careful letting it impact our ability to grow as a collaboration)

We feel the text is sufficiently clear – ⅔ of the Council should cast a positive vote for admission. In practice (as a previous Council chair for STAR, where this threshold is set at ¾) it may only put an additional load on the CC chair to reach out to people to fulfill their obligtions and cast their vote. In my (Olga's) 4-year experience with multiple groups admitted, we have NEVER failed an admission because of shortage of votes.

94
"institutional institutions" is somewhat awkward to me
Fixed.

146
Seems like a repeat of the point above it
Removed.

229

A small foot note on what Rober's Rules of Order are might help a reader who isn't aware of what that means

We are adding a short footnote on this, in the charter document.

282
Missing space: "(CTC)is"

Fixed

391
I assume you don't mean that a person can only run for election once in their entire career? If so that you might want to end the sentence with "An individual .... , in a given election". If this does pretend to how many times a person can run, I think its a bit extreme and perhaps something like "cannot appear on the ballot for two subsequent elections" can be considered by the committee

This was meant to say that one could not run alone AND as part of the team in the same election. Text is removed. Either way, the single spokesperson route is now the only option in the charter, based on collaboration feedback.

Vitaliy Fadeyev

Our (UCSC) preference is to have a single spokesperson.

Adopted.

Charles E. Hyde

As the charter stands, all elections are made by the Collaboration Council. This fundamentally undermines the principles of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion - as the vast majority of the Collaboration is excluded from any formal role.
The Spokesperson should be elected by the collaboration at large. At least 50% of the Executive Board and DEI committee should be elected by the collaboration at large.

OE: As written, the Council elects all Council positions and Council committees, which we believe is appropriate in an association as an international scientific collaboration where the members are the institutions, and not individual scientists. The representatives of each institution in the CC have the responsibility to discuss major decisions within their institution members. The possibility of electing a Spokesperson by everyone directly was certainly discussed, but was not broadly supported. In any case, to our knowledge, all major collaborations in HEP and Nuclear Physics adopt the proposed scheme.

It seems strange to me to charge the Spokesperson with appointing a Deputy Spokesperson. The election committee should help in recruiting candidate Deputy Spokesperson . There should either be rotating Spokesperson-line or an election of a "team" of linked spokesperson and deputy candidates

The committee felt that the compatibility and dynamics of the Spokesperson/Deputy team is very important; we believe it is most productive for the elected leader to pick their own team – The Collaboration Council retains the right to not endorse the proposed candidate(s) if they see something troubling.

Sal Fazio

62

The scope of this chapter is to define the roles of the Collaboration vs the Project as the two entities that work together for a successful realization of ePIC. It correctly states that the EIC Project is an invaluable source of information and technical guidance to optimize the design of EPIC and its integration into the EIC machine, whereas the Collaboration is the entity ultimately responsible for the design a detector system that achieves the EIC physics programmatic goals.

In this view of defining the to scopes of these two entities that work together towards the same goal, we find the following text a little ambiguous:

"While unforeseen requirements from the EIC Project may require modifications to the detector design, the Collaboration will reserve the option to review technical proposals made by the EIC Project and report their finding to the EIC project. This may even necessitate the Spokesperson(s) to call for a Collaboration Council vote, especially if the change is perceived to substantially modify the physics capabilities of EPIC."

As the text currently reads, it seems to foresee instances where the EIC project sets forward unforeseen requirements (correctly so, given that this is withing the project's scope) and it also proposes solutions that the Collaboration might decide to "fight" against, calling for special reviews...
Instead, any time that the Project identifies new unforeseen constraints that would require substantial modifications to the ePIC detector design, the Collaboration always should review them, work with the Project and come back with proposed solutions. This should be a standard procedure any time such an event arises as to give the WGs a chance to review the possible modifications and also assess their impact on the physics program. If something is the standard procedure within the scope of the Collaboration (the entity ultimately responsible for the detector design) , it's not perceived as being aggressive and does not put additional responsibility burdens on the Collaboration management.

Therefore, we suggest to modify the text to something like the following:

"Whenever unforeseen constraints identified by the EIC Project require substantial modifications to the detector design, the Collaboration will work with the EIC Project on

related technical proposals, will assess the impact on physics capabilities of EPIC and will report their findings to the EIC project. In cases of particular relevance, this may even necessitate the Spokesperson(s) to call for a Collaboration Council vote on the proposed changes."

We agree - and this text was adopted.

89
"DEI Committee" acronym not yet introduced, please do so in line 76
Fixed.

94
"institutional institutions" --> "Institutions"
Fixed.

156
"requalification may be needed" --> "requalification is needed"
i it important to be affirmative here. Either we do not foresee a requalification or we do. We should avoid things being handles differently for different people
The ambiguity was intentional, and was retained. We envisioned corner cases, e.g. assume the case of a very active person spending years on EPIC but getting sick (or pregnant) and taking some time off. In such a case, it is not obvious that demanding requalification is the best route here, so left flexible. Further clarifications could of course be addressed in EPIC policies.

365
"50% of the CC votes cast" --> "50%+1 of the CC votes cast"
Changed to "more than 50%"

Ernst Sichtermann

Section 1, introduction starts out somewhat problematic in the current stage of the project, from my point of view. First, the collaboration is a collaboration of people, not institutions. Clearly, people are associated with institutions and those can be committed to goals beyond the individual. It is, furthermore, international by its very composition. The word "international" does not occur anywhere within the draft-charter (!). I consider this problematic. Thirdly, it is advisable to upfront consider our relation to the project. Starting out by "the collaboration builds the detector" will need careful coordination with the project and the DOE in the current organization of the EIC project. Who has the final responsibility for building the instrument? What is the (line-) management structure beyond the collaboration? Has this aspect been coordinated with the project, the host laboratories, and possibly

further? If not, the current phrasing may become a non-starter or set up the collaboration for incorporating a large part of DOE order 413.3b into its organization.

"International" is added. The discussion of the relationship with the project was improved. EPIC has no power to dictate the project how to form line-management structure beyond the collaboration, and thus this is impossible to address in the Charter.

Section 2, the intent here may be fine, but is not clear what it means. Assume that the council votes against a particular modification. Then what? Is the collaboration here seeking to be(-come) formally integrated into the project organization? The statements made here (may) have serious implications for the organization of the detector (sub-)project. Socialization, if this has not already been done, may be necessary. As written, this section may come across as an "us versus them" between collaboration and project - this would be off-putting.

The expectation is that the project and funding agencies will pay attention and take into consideration the Collaboration opinion (especially if supported through the vote by majority of institutions).

Section 3. I am sorely missing "international" and "science" in this section (and the charter as a whole). The later part of the section appears to focus on "punishment" as written. There is no question, in my mind, that certain actions must have consequences looking into the future, where they have not in the past with all sorts of consequences in the present. However, as written, I again find this section particularly off-putting. It is well-possible to communicate a complete disregard for science, scientists, and scientific concepts respectfully. It is equally possible to accomplish nothing, in a welcoming, inclusive, and respectful way. I would want to see "form" _and_ "function" from this charter, with one being seen as integral to the success of the other and vice-versa.

"international" and "science" aspects are added to the Charter. The "function" will be defined in a subsequent CoC policy, which we feel is a more appropriate place than in the Charter.

135
Rights are great. So are obligations. And privileges. These concepts are not interchangeable.

We agree, but the experimental "obligations," apart from those already introduced in Community Values, will be changing over time so it is impractical to attempt to define them in the Charter. Instead, as the Charter states, it will be defined in the Membership/authorship policy. In addition, we have strengthened the Community Values "expectations" to follow the CoC.

Francesco Bossù

on the matter of inactive IR in CC votes: rather than banning them from voting for a year (which penalises their whole institution) and the public shaming (which is a bit vindictive) I think it would be more constructive to inform all members of the institution that their IR is not representing them and require an immediate IR change

We felt that it is the duty of the IR to represent their Institution; there are multiple provisions for assigning alternative representatives, and/or proxy. However, in case of inaction, we agree that all members of the Institution should be informed by the CC so they can select someone else.

on the simple majority vote -- should there not be a minimum quorum to ensure validity? What if only five people bother to vote? I know it's unlikely to be reached, but maybe something like 25%, just to ensure that the vote has some minimal legitimacy…

OE: We consider this matter to be of "low risk:" all major decisions require a well-defined quorum. Routine decisions (adopting minutes, etc.) do not. We rely on Council leadership to be able to take appropriate action (extending the voting time, for example) if the participation appears marginal. The above point (removing inactive IRs) should also generally help with voting participation.

it is not clear if one can serve in several roles/committees. It should be clarified what is allowed (spokesperson, DEI, CC (CC chair) and EB)

The Charter deliberately makes no restrictions to allow for more flexibility, especially during collaboration formation. In any case, the Charter language should be flexible and more freedom left to the policies (TBD by the Council).

Rachel Montgomery

Capitalisation and acronyms needs standardised throughout.

Fixed (or at least attempted!)

Section 2 states "The Collaboration is responsible to design a detector system that achieves the EIC physics programmatic goals, as defined in the NAS report." It makes it sound like EPIC is only charged with designing the detector, not future physics operations at the EIC once the detector is constructed. But then in line 73 it says "This includes access to any and all data taken in the course of the operation of the experiment" as if the collaboration will continue beyond detector construction to perform physics analysis.

Good point, we now mention detector operations.

it would be useful to have a diagram of the proposed collaboration structure.

This is a reasonable request and will be provided soon.

2 years max for spokesperson might be a little but short to make a true impact. Further - do run groups have spokespeople too? This could be good as point of contacts to make clear physics/analysis needs of specific channels to the spokesperson.

Two 2-year terms are allowed; 4 years is a sufficiently long time and is not uncommon. We are not sure what "run groups" are but we don't envision formal Spokesperson roles except for the one leading the collaboration.

In general, I don't think 2 weeks notice is enough considering there are membership implications for people who do not respond. 2 weeks is better. People take 2 weeks holiday regularly and emails can get lost immediately before and after holiday due to simple email and meeting loads.

This has been updated to three weeks

42
super majority could be introduced/defined here
A reference to the Election and Voting provisions is added

100
Lines 100-102 are confusing, it's a little bit muddy - does each person have individual requirements to be a member as well as group wide requirements and are individuals punished then for failure of group wide commitments?

Since membership is awarded by group, it is correct that there are consequences on individual members for inability of a group to keep up its commitments. This is left intentionally vague in the Charter, such that it can be further specified in the EPIC Membership Policy, which we expect to evolve over time.

126
Sounds like being a member in good standing will grant you authorship on papers. However previously on 101 sounds like depends on individual contributions. Do all members automatically go on all papers?I appreciate this is unknown as mentioned in line 146 but the language until this point could be clarified.

Membership in good standing is a precondition for authorship, so we believe the text is consistent.

206
what is the purpose of the spokespeople having to be ex-CC people

This line indicates that the Spokesperon and deputies are ex-officio voting members of the CC, i.e. they receive their membership by virtue of their roles.

229
Robert's rules should be referenced or defined
A footnote on this has been added.

lines 249-254. This penalises the whole institution for one individual (who may have personal or other issues affecting them eg). It would be more construvtive for the CC chair to engage in dialogue with an insitutuion to arrange another institution rep, and also avoid public shaming on mailing lists. It is impossible to anticipate complications that may be going on in other people's lives and affect their work commitments. Private dialogue to resolve the issue should be a first cause of action. Followed by dialogue with all of an offending institutions members to elect a new representative.

We feel It is the duty of the IR to represent their Institution; there are multiple provisions for assigning an alternative representative, and/or voting proxy. Also please note that an Institution can change their Representative at any point, so there is no obvious reason for an institution to have no representation at three consecutive meetings. We agree that all members of the Institution should be informed (this is in the hands of the Council), so they can select someone else in case their current Representative is unable to fulfill their duties. In practice, we are confident that whomever leads the Council will be wise enough to reach out to the IR first.

358
an institutional rep could be on holiday for 2 weeks, or 1 week research followed by two weeks holiday and miss the call for a vote. I'm not sure 2 weeks notice is enough for institutional reps in general. 3 weeks would be safer.
Updated to 3 weeks

Yaping Wang
Agree with the current version.
Thank you!

Abdel Nasser Tawfik
I prefer to elect ONE spokesperson.

Christine Nattrass

I don't think the full IB should have to vote to expel a member. I have never seen an IB which would do this. IBs default to not doing anything vaguely controversial, in part because there's too many people and each individual member does not know enough about the case to want to hurt someone. I know Olga said times have changed, but I don't think they've changed that much. What we did in sPHENIX was to put the power in the executive committee, which is smaller and where each member is heavily engaged in the collaboration. (Not that IB members aren't doing their duty, but they may have different responsibilities.) I understand people want some due process, but there are other ways. For instance, you could have an executive committee vote to expel someone, with a 2/3 majority vote, and then allow the IB to reverse it, perhaps with a 2/3 majority vote - or even with a majority vote, I think if the IB were reversing a decision made by a smaller, deliberative body, the dynamics would be different. IBs do not want to harm someone; if the executive committee makes the decision, it is not the IB doing it.

A smaller body making the decision would also mean that the gory details are not known around the entire collaboration. If the IB is to act as a jury, they must know EVERYTHING. If you had been sexually assaulted by a collaborator, would you want everyone in the collaboration to know? Even for less egregious things, no grad student wants to be known as, "that woman who got stalked." This is better for everyone involved, but especially if the vote to expel someone fails, especially narrowly. And if the IB is the jury, everyone on the IB ought to have at least some relevant training - is that practical?!? Furthermore, with a large body involving the entire collaboration must vote on expelling someone, since the stakes are so high if it fails, the bar for kicking someone out is actually way higher than 2/3 - I wouldn't bring such a vote to the IB unless I thought the vote would be around 90% in favor.

It is CRITICAL that there is a realistic way to expel someone. Without this, bad behavior will persist. The worst case scenario, in case of egregious bad behavior which should result in expulsion is that the person is not expelled. It is demoralizing and sends the message that, whatever words may be in a code of conduct, they don't mean anything. Being in that spot, where a vote is brought to the IB to expel someone and it fails, especially narrowly, would be toxic to the collaboration.

Ultimately, I think this provision is poorly thought through and has a ton of unintended consequences. One does not need to specify the procedure in the charter, but could say that it should be specified in the code of conduct, which must be brought to the IB for a vote. That means you don't have to decide yet but could work with the DEI committee on a procedure which would satisfy everyone.

"Qualification tasks" are a terrible idea! It has clearly already been raised that this is onerous for faculty and especially those at teaching universities. It is used in ATLAS and CMS and I have seen some horrible cases where it really harmed tenure track faculty's careers because they couldn't get on the author list because they have too many other commitments to devote 6 months to doing something not directly related to their job which won't demonstrate leadership. If you are a PI on a grant funded on EPIC and supervising students and post docs on EPIC, you obviously should be an author. I think STAR and PHENIX's policies worked and they involved way less bureaucracy and hassle. I would very strongly favor something way less bureaucratic and potentially onerous.

We envision "qualification tasks" to be very different for incoming students and faculty members (and we feel that student supervision and training should count for faculty). These tasks will be separately defined (and voted on) in the Membership Policy.

Zvi Citron

Although there are many caveats already written about things changing in the future regarding authorship, I already at this point suggest a slight modification. I think we should consider the cases in which a group leader joins the collaboration (presumably with a group) somewhat differently from the standard qualification process. In such cases I think (at least in most of such cases) asking the group leader to do a qualification task, won't really be an efficient use of resources. For example in an extreme case in which a group joins with a large number students/post-docs, I think what we want from the group leader is 1) bringing those people in and 2) helping/supervising/managing them in their qualification task as well as eventual non-qualification work. To ask the group leader to also do a qualification task at the same time, seems likely to be problematic one way or another (delays, passing work to others officially or not, neglect of other contributions to the collaboration, etc). I admit that I don't have a concrete solution to this problem, but it seems to me that since the requirements are at this point anyway not spelled out precisely a sentence mentioning an alternative to the ~6 month task depending on the situation would be good.

We envision that "qualification tasks" could be very different for incoming students and faculty members (and we feel that student supervision and training should count for faculty). These tasks will be separately defined (and voted on) in the Membership Policy.

Douglas Higinbotham

EIC project is officially being lead by BNL and JLab and that should be officially reflected in the charter. (i.e. document shouldn't just refer to BNL)

Fixed.

The introduction should make the international nature of the collaboration clear. Another general comments was to add the "obvious" standing committees to the charter instead of leaving them for policy.

Added

Note the detailed comments from Rolf and Marcus on the attached pdf.

Pietro Antonioli
I would recommend among the elected members "at large" of the management board It is designed some representation scheme (as in the EICUG SC let's say) ensuring some space for non U.S. members. I believe this would contribute to create a balanced/open/inclusive environment. Of course, per se there will be also the possibility of non-US spokesperson/deputy and other apical roles, but the three members elected should have some "built-in" representation scheme. In the wording you could say "three elected members at large, with at least one of them not coming from U.S. institutions..." etc.

We have discussed this and have amended the charter text to reflect our expectation that the at-large members should reflect the geographic diversity of the collaboration.

56
to design --> to design, construct, commission and operate
Fixed

338
use consistently Executive Board with E and B capital also eat 341
Fixed

343
There is no guidance for elections not specified (for example members at large of executive board. We should say which majority (I guess simple) is requested in these cases.
This is specified in election policy: all votes other than those designated as "major decisions" require a simple majority

Gabriele Carini

Having prior experience, and not seeing provisions in this document for Talks and Publication categories, there may be the need to define Instrumentation Papers, Technical Paper, Machine construction Papers and Physics Papers or something along this line (can add more details and rational based on our experience in DUNE).
We have left this matter for the eventual Publication Policy.

Committees in 5.5 may be listed in alphabetical order - or the list represent priorities already discussed and agreed upon?

Regarding DEI, 7 members could be a good representative number and reduce the risk of bias.

There could be place for a board of trustees. It could add some integral part of control in the whole collaboration and stabilization for defending the best interest of collaboration and stakeholders. Other bodies diversified across several axes may be requiring some high reputation body on top to assure stability and act as appeal for example decisions of other bodies.

How to appeal being suspended/dismissed from the collaboration in the current charter? There is nothing about it only that expulsion can be decided or voted – this may not be sufficient to guarantee objectiveness.

The current text ("a minimum of 5") provides the flexibility. Appeal (as well as details of review procedures for complaints) are left for the CoC policy. The charter text has now and added reference to the CoC for details.

Line 188 has double word "election" or misses comma.
Fixed

Line 282 misses space after (CTC)
Fixed.

Alexander Kiselev
after having read the document and the extensive comments / questions by Oleg, Thomas, Elke, Brian and others, let me ask you a question. Was this charter draft a green field exercise, or was it based on a similar document / documents used in other collaborations of this scale? In the latter case, which one(s) and for which phase of a particular experiment lifetime?

The Charter committee has reviewed multiple charter examples from experiments in different phases of their respective lifetimes, and brings experience from ATHENA, as well as several RHIC and LHC experiments.

As pointed out by several people already, it almost sounds like this is a document we are adopting for 2029+ rather than for the construction years, to start with. Communication with the project is outlined very schematically. From a practical perspective, presence of the spokesperson team on site can perhaps be added as a policy later on, but in fact this position should probably be formulated right in the charter, as a full time tenure where physical presence is an important indication of a full commitment. The balance of powers mentioned in one of the first charter paragraphs, has seemingly a bias towards giving CC

more power, beyond just policy making and including elements of the executive one, with a bit too much emphasis on the "punishment-like" prerogatives. It almost sounds to me the DEI role in this charter can be downplayed a bit, and - as it was also mentioned already - the idea of equity by the outcome should probably be somehow re-formulated towards equity of the possibilities based on the scientific skills.

Thank you for your comments. Our draft was informed by examples of other successful collaborations. We believe it is good to start the EPIC collaboration with a robust Charter. There is no doubt that it will further evolve, but at the same time it is important to start with a certain set of rules and norms. This is also very important for institutions that will join EPIC in the coming months, after its formal founding.

DEI is a DOE priority and our approach is well in line with similar approaches in many organizations (including ejection of members violating the CoC).

I prefer a single spokesperson + a deputy (or deputies), elected together as a team.
Adopted.

I also have a short list of typos, not mentioned by other people yet. Though not sure we are in a proof reading mode already.
We have fixed many typos and wording mistakes based on collaboration input.

Elke Aschenauer

General:

I think the writing committee is not fully aware of how a project in the US works.
The EIC project is responsible to DOE that what is built meets the mission needs and the KPPs as defined by DOE.
The collaboration is working with the project, but the ultimate decision on scope, cost and schedule lies with the project director.
Here is what has been shown to the collaboration several times
"A sensible option to enhance Collaboration-Project synergy is to have the collaboration come in as technical point-of-contacts/point of contacts for most technologies (L3/L4/L5) to directly work with the L3 (or L4) CAMs; to be Work Package owners.
We must work hand in hand, in that much detector technology and experimental program expertise lies with the collaboration, yet BNL (and JLab as partner) are in the end accountable to DOE/NP:
"the overall EIC project decision-making authority is vested in the EIC Project Director, as described in the Project Management Plan; and the Project Director reports to the BNL Lab director who is accountable to Office of Science."

I think it is important the writing committee and the CC are familiar how a project of the size of EIC works.

I think the entire document should acknowledge more that we are currently in a very different phase then operations.

The text has been modified to emphasize the collaborative spirit of this document. We strongly agree that close collaboration between the EIC Project and EPIC is crucial for a successful facility and scientific program. We fully support the suggestion to have EPIC members work with the Project directly, and we hope that the project will consider collaboration input on specific appointments. On the other hand we believe the Project should understand the concerns of EPIC as a large international collaboration, e.g. we welcome recent efforts to form an RRB for the detector.   The proposed text addresses concerns within EPIC about the EIC Project reasonably making important decisions potentially, but perhaps without consent of the EPIC scientific community. This section was included with a constructive spirit but also to make clear that the close collaboration will take conscious effort by both sides.

There was the question about the number of spokespersons, I think one with 2 deputies is the right approach.
Adopted.

I think there should be more separation between powers, the spokesperson team should be able to select their team without to much interference of the CC also the collaboration as a large has basically no rights as all gets decided by the CC, there are no preventions to ensure the CC members talk to their members. I think all information needs to be sent to the collaboration at large so people have a chance to contact their IR.
We agree on the first point, and the intent of the Charter is that the Spokesperson selects a team. While Council does have endorsing power, it is not expected to be used for nit-picking on the choices, but rather for a feedback in case of accidental imbalances/DEI issues. We presume this will not to be a problem for a wise spokesperson and we expect no different kind! Information about all things "external" to Council – spokespeople bio, management plans, proposals, as well as Council meeting minutes will be shared with the full collaboration (as already

described). We added that the election vote announcements are to be sent to the whole Collaboration to facilitate member involvement.

Detailed comments:
34: run —> operate
Text is updated.

39: limited term in office —> duration of terms
We have kept the original text: "duration of terms" suggests how long each position lasts, we are talking about no more than 2 terms for all elected roles, but indeed mean that both are limited.

47 to 50: it is JLAB and BNL as the EIC built in partnership, it is not only DOE, but also international funding agencies which contribute, also there is the EIC Project, which is the next 10 years the main partner
OE: Fixed

61: the EPIC management is responsible to the EIC project. In every project I have been and it have been some by now some project representative has been part of the executive collaboration group.

We agree that representation on the project to the experiment, and have added this text to the charter: "The EIC project may appoint a liaison officer who would typically be invited to regular EB meetings, and act in an advisory role."

section 3: I think scientific excellence should be the most important goal and DEI should be a way reach it this section has quite some repetition
Added here and into Intro

96: what is a PHD-level scientist 2 postdocs or a prof and a postdoc or ///?
We have left this language for flexibility (to accommodate countries where PhD is not required for tenure-like research or teaching position). Generally, we anticipate a PI and one more scientist (say PI+Postdoc) for the minimal group size.

101: on their satisfaction of collaboration requirements —> english
Updated

section 4.2: what happens with equipment which might have been provided by an institution, if this institution leaves. Who will operate the sub-detector and
so on

We discussed this, but we found no way to formulate a universal approach to this issue in the charter. Thus, this shall have to be further developed within the context of EPIC policy, with a view to the multilateral agreements between funding agencies.

section 4.5: what is a 6 month task, do we require senior university professors to do analysis?
To run a group find the money, support the students and so on is important work and a contribution to the collaboration.
We agree that "qualification tasks" could be very different for incoming students and faculty members, and we agree that student supervision and training MUST count for faculty.. These tasks will be separately defined (and voted on) in the Membership Policy.

section 5.1: the working group conveners should be endorsed by the Executive committee only as most likely a majority of the CC do not even know the people
We feel that the WG and detector convenors are crucial for the careers of all mid-level scientists and their appointment should be visible to the collaboration. A simple endorsement of the incoming convenors every year will be no particular load on the CC and will only increase engagement on both sides, by making the CC aware of the vital young people running the physics program, and increasing the visibility of the convenors to the EIC scientific community.

197: IR is used before but not introduced
It was introduced in line 98

section 5.2: it would be good to have official accessible list of PhD students and early career members =<5 years
This has already been recommended to the SC and they have started the process of compiling it.

section 5.3: how is block voting avoided, a common problem in some collaborations that causes problems in spokesperson and other elections.
We feel that institutes can vote however they wish and we could envision no principled way to identify or avoid groups of institutes voting together to advance their collective interests.

section 5.5: DEI why is scientific excellence no mentioned.

Scientific excellence is the goal for EPIC, not a DEI duty. That said, some clarifying wording has been added to the introduction and Community Values sections.

Conference and Talks committee: a discussion about exceptions is needed, like invited talks, they should not go through the committee
We feel this belongs to a separate Publication Policy

section 6.1: the spokespeople serve for the collaboration as a whole not only the council.
We agree with your statement. The text states "at the discretion of the Council," not "to the Council;" and "their task is to … represent Collaboration," so we feel there are no needed changes.

I think it is crazy that every taskforce needs to be approved by the CC, if there is to much oversight one will not find peopel to run as spokesperson
While we take issue with you calling our work "crazy", we agree that small task forces of limited duration can be managed via the Executive Boad.

section 6.2: why are the physics and technical coordinator ex-officio, they are critical function running the collaboration
We agree that these roles are critical to the functioning of the EPIC collaboration, although further discussion has led to us deciding to not make their inclusion automatic, but to leave it to the discretion of the Spokesperson, since the nature of the top level jobs will certainly evolve over time. Thus, we have made their inclusion an expectation of the collaboration, that could well be formalized in the near future as policy: "It is expected that top level activity coordinators will be members of the EB"

Brian Page
General: I would encourage the draft be sent to several people not involved in the writing to be proof-read and checked for consistent usage of terminology
We have done this.

General / Sec 2: I find it a bit strange that, besides Sec 2, there is no acknowledgement in the Charter that the for the next ~8 years we will be (in concert with the project) constructing the experiment and that this may necessitate certain positions/policies/procedures that will not be needed once regular operations start. Was there any discussion along these lines within the writing committee? For example, I could see that we would not want to be changing Spokespersons every two years during construction. We may also want a spokesperson-level person in charge of implementation, construction, and related issues.

The charter specifies only major issues, while more detailed considerations will be addressed as "policies," as the charter mentions. Two 2-year terms are allowed for Spokesperson, so 4 years total (if they don't screw up) which we felt was sufficient to allow for substantial contributions to EPIC without impeding the evolution of the collaboration.

Sec. 4.1:
Lines 95 – 97: Is there a distinction between PhD level scientist and a PhD scientist in a permanent (or permanent track) position for viability? In other words, is a group with one permanent scientist and one Post-Doc viable? What happens to a group if it shrinks to one PhD scientist? Were the cases of small groups (one P.I. with a couple of grad students or a technician) discussed?
The current text provides for flexibility (i.e. "typical," "PHD-level"); it thus supplies general expectations, allowing the Council to decide on a case-by-case basis.

Lines 97 – 98: This wording seems to exclude the possibility of an engineer or technician serving as an IR on the CC, was this the intent?
This was not the intention. Changed to "institution member."

Sec. 4.2:
Lines 121 – 122: This line states that requests to remove a collaboration member which come from someone else in the collaboration will be referred to the 'EPIC management team', does this mean the spokesperson(s) and executive council or does it include the CC (vice) chairperson as well? The line goes on to say that the complaint _may_ be referred to the CC for a vote. I would think that all petitions to remove a collaborator should be seen by the full CC (doesn't need to be in an open session), or we risk having cases where complaints can be quietly killed by management.
Text is updated to add "to Collaboration Council" and to state that procedures will be defined in the Code of Conduct policy.

Sec. 4.3:
Line 130: A Membership Committee is referred to as the body which will make determinations on individual and institutions good standing status. As this is a critical function, the Membership Committee should be defined and listed with the other standing committees in Sec. 5.5.
Done

Is it envisioned that individuals/institutions will be admitted to the collaboration in good standing or is this a status which must initially be earned?
If MGS is a status which must be earned (via service work, shifts, etc), I don't see the need to have separate 'author' criteria.

In steady state, EPIC institutions will join as members and will be promoted to "good standing" on a reasonable time scale, based on criteria to be defined precisely in collaboration policy. During the initial collaboration formation, this process would be cumbersome, so all currently-particpating institutions will be promoted to good-standing based on their existing contributions. However, they will be reviewed in the next 6-12 months by the Membership Committee, again based on EPIC policies, and their continued good standing will rely on appropriate contributions made over that period.

Line 167: … responsibility on the experiment -> responsibility for the experiment
Done

Line 336: Physics and detector integration coordinators should be defined
Removed

Sec. 7:
Line 382: CC Chairs do not run as members of a team
The text specifies that one (vice) Chair is elected each year, and then continues as a Chair in their second year (i.e. according to chair-line)

Line 390: Should be explicitly stated that SP candidate statements and management plans should be distributed to the entire collaboration.
Done

Make explicit whether or not the SP can serve consecutive terms
SP can serve consecutive terms.

Oleg E
Hello Peter & all,

Thank you for sending this around and also for the reminder after last week's report.

As a general comment, the document should receive a careful proof-read for consistent capitalization and use of specific positions and groups. Once voted on, any change has to go through a new vote for modifications. For example, the Council is repeatedly said to have co-chairs, which only later is clarified as being a chair and a vice-chair.
 A Membership Committee is mentioned in line 130 but not detailed in the Committee section later on.
Fixed.

Institutional Representatives are called Institution Representatives early in the document (in line 410 also "council representative").

Fixed.

Below are more detailed comments --- sorry, they got a little long in the end.

Line 50: Collaboration Council Board -> Collaboration Council

Fixed.

Line 52: Council leadership -> Council Chair

We have kept the original text, since it is meant to refer to both Chair and Vice chair.

Section 2: I may be just reading this wrong, but the Project is responsible for the deliverables and therefore the construction of the detector. I don't know what is achieved by adding that the Collaboration is responsible "to design [the] detector" and that they reserve the option to review technical proposals by the Project and report their findings to them.

The text is modified to highlight cooperation intentions.

Line 68: I feel that the inclusion of equity in the principles should warrant a few more details about what this actually means for the governance of the Collaboration and the scientific work.

The details are left for the mentioned CoC policy to be developed by the EPIC

Line 87: "we work" looks like it was copied from somewhere else. Everything else written in a neutral, third person point of view.

Fixed

Line 94: "institutional institutions"

Fixed

Line 96: "PhD level scientists" I assume this means postgraduate and aims to include postdocs. It does explicitly exclude scientists without a doctorate though. What happens to small groups when there is a transition time without any postdocs?

The current text provides for flexibility (i.e. "typical," "PHD-level"); this outlines the general expectation leaving the Council to decide on the case-by-case basis.

Line 117: "Institutions can be […] suspended at the discretion of CC management." For such an important topic, this needs to be very clear to avoid any confusion or debate. Does this

mean that the Council Chair can suspend an institution? If so, what is the time within which the Council has to vote?

The text says "**asked** to leave," so this is a voluntary action (say, the group has already left EPIC, and not active, but did not bother to close a loop. They could be prodded about their interest to continue). "Against the will " suspensions all require a supermajority vote, also as stated.

Line 121: Similar to the previous, what are the steps in the process? Can anyone propose to have another collaborator dismissed? Is there a review? Is the DEI Committee included in the process?

The text has been modified to state that dismissal of individual members will be handled according to the provisions of the CoC policy.

Line 146: Redundant to the last bullet point.

Removed

Line 150: "Since this isn't part of the original set of institutions…" Not sure what this means.

Rephrased.

Line 153: "a task requiring about six months" From the following sentence, I understand that this is a maximum in terms of calendar time, not full time involvement.

The specifics of this are to be developed/provided by the membership policy. The duration of 6 months is to set a scale for how long it should take to qualify, after initially joining the collaboration.

Line 167: The Council is the governing body and responsible for policy decisions. The responsibility "on the experiment" should be with the executive, i.e. the Spokesperson.

Agreed, text removed.

Line 179: Shouldn't the Physics and Technical Coordinators be proposed by the Spokesperson? I don't understand the difference between an approval and endorsement by the Council. While I think it makes sense, that members of the management team need to be approved by the Council, the Working Group Conveners should be appointed (with input from the working groups).

We utilize the term endorsement to indicate approval/acknowledgement of an executive decision. We expect nominations and appointments to flow through the Executive Board (SP, technical coordination, physics coordination)

Line 200: Who does the review of Institutions in good standing? The Membership Committee comes to mind and, if so, it should be added to the list of standing Committees.

The Membership Committee is tasked with this, and has been added to the list of standing committees.

Line 203: Here it explicitly says "renewable only once" as opposed to two term limit. Does this mean that a Council Chair can be elected again at a later time if there was a break in between?
An EPIC collaborator is limited to two terms as CC chair, whether consecutive or separated in time. Updated.

Line 206: I suggest to define "Voting Council Members" as opposed to ex-officio. This will also help to clarify possible misunderstanding in the voting section later (where Voting should be capitalized.)
Changed to "non-voting ex-officio members"

Line 216: "An early career member elected during their fourth year after PhD…" Does this mean that postdocs in their fifth year are not eligible at all?
Changed to "fourth or fifth"

Line 231: missing "to" in "the opportunity to request". The sentence as a whole is a bit long. "Should" -> "shall" (maybe in other places too?)
Fixed

Major votes leaves room for interpretation. I suggest to distinguish between Membership votes and other votes that only require a simple majority. Simple majorities don't need to require a quorum, but there nothing that prevents from such a requirement.
List of major decisions is added.

Committees:
The composition of the DE&I Council is open to interpretation. Does the Chair make a selection from the nominations from the Collaboration? If not, why include this step? Who decides on the actual size of the Committee?
The Council is responsible to endorse the members, so this will help prevent mis-steps.

Does the Talks Committee really need an endorsement from the Council? Who chooses the Chair?
We expect the CC chair will solicit nominations and come up with a balanced committee. The Council has the right to endorse, including the chair, so this will prevent mis-steps.

I am not convinced that the Publications Committee should be the interface between journals and the Collaboration. It has been good practice in many collaborations that the PAs do this for their publications. Would it be an option to combine this with the Talks Committee?

OE: We believe this is a better option. It is a common practice for most Collaborations, and prevents many mistakes.

I expected to see the Election Committee included in the list of standing committees with all the many required approvals from the Council.

The Election committee is described in the Elections and Voting section; it is now made a standing committee

Line 320: The Spokesperson should not have the right to assign members to ad-hoc committees, as these are different from task-forces.

We see no problem with this (as long as those are not policy-related committees that belong to the council). One recent example is beam use request committees of RHIC collaborations.

Line 326: I think it is counterproductive to exclude people from a second term if they have been Co-Spokespersons in such a way. Especially, since the Council Chair line explicitly emphasizes the advantages of continuity.

This is no longer relevant; single spokesperson route is adopted.

Line 332: Physics policy?

Yes, e.g. what energies/species to prioritize.

Line 336: This should be Physics Coordinator (or Physics Analysis Coordinator?) and Technical Coordinator. Was a Computing Coordinator discussed?

Removed.

Line 394: Shouldn't this be part of the discussion before the election?

The candidate statements will be available to the Collaboration before the election, and they could include some aspects of the intended management plan. However, it is practical to finalize these plans after the election and have CC endorse it. One example would be the winner inviting a losing party as deputy.

Line 404: Again, I don't understand the reasoning behind this. Either way, it should also be specified whether a "team" in this case extends to a single person running for Spokesperson.

Single spokesperson route is adopted.

Dave M

Hi Peter et al,

Thanks for circulating this draft charter! Of course, I have some comments. I hope you'll find them useful.

Is a charter the same ting as by-laws? Or do by-laws come later? If so, how do the two documents relate to one another?
The idea here is that the charter is the set of principles underlying the more detailed policies (aka by-laws)

The charter allocates a lot of language to the process of getting rid of collaborators and/or collaborating institutions. Seems depressing to me. I don't see why so much of that language should be in the charter.
Charter includes all important aspects of collaboration life; thus, it seems proper that if we ever have to dismiss someone for, say, inappropriate behavior, it should not be left to some temporary document. We do not expect to need this process very often, but it helps to have it defined.

l32-35 and l56-57: These sentences each define the purpose of the EPIC collaboration, but they seem to say slightly different things. For instance, the first lines say that the aim of the collaboration is "to build and run the EPIC detector". I *think* the construction of the detector is – strictly speaking – the responsibility of the EIC project. The collaboration holds the scientific responsibility for operating EPIC and exploiting its scientific potential. That seems clear in l56-57, but I think l32-35 muddle things.
Text is modified to: "EPIC (Electron-Proton/Ion Collider Experiment) is a collaboration of international Institutions, which have joined together to design, construct, commission and operate the EPIC detector to exploit the physics potential of the Electron-Ion Collider." We see it as a true statement, and do not see a conflict with Project roles/responsibilities.

l68: Is "democracy" really a guiding principle of the collaboration?
Yes, we feel that elections are part of a democratic process.

l133-134: Does merely attending CC meeting count as "participation"?
Attending and taking part in the CC votes is expected; the latter is further spelled out in the text.

l159: "who left EPIC less than a year ago" – I sorta know what's intended, but this can easily be read to mean "a year ago" before today, October 11, 2022.
It is meant to be a year before the paper in question.

l229: Is Robert's Rules of Order really the right thing to follow? Seems overly formal. It's a 700 page book. There are plenty of simplified versions that might be more appropriate.

The Charter only reserves the option to invoke the RoR when informal discussions become sufficiently difficult to require more structure.

l313-314: "The spokesperson(s) serve [...] with the advice of the executive board." This makes it sound like the spokesperson is required to follow the advice of the Executive Council. Is that the intent?
We feel that "advice" is merely advice. The Charter does not dictate a requirement to follow it.

l359: "Voting on routing Council matters" – I presume this is meant to be "Voting on routine Council matters"
Fixed, thank you.

l359-360: This is a bit confusing. Do CC votes on routine issues have to be cast in person? The text seems to say so.
The text says "may be done," at the discretion of the Chair. ("in-person" format nowadays is also zoom meetings)

l385-387: A new spokesperson every two years? That seems like a very rapid cadence of leadership turnover.
The Charter says a spokesperson can be reelected, giving a total duration of four years.

Thomas U

(1) I understand that there is a charter that is hard to change (like a constitution) and policies that are more fluent and can be adapted more easily (laws). If this is so, then in the current version there are too many topics that do not belong in the charter
Example: Section 2, the project-collaboration relation should be a policy, it might need to change as we go along, and it becomes obsolete with CD-4.
Example: Admission and Suspension, one could also see this more as a policy.
Example: 5.3 a detailed list of council operation. One can see this changing as we move on. Also probably better "Council Operation" policy.
We agree, in general. However, we felt it is inappropriate to vote on a "vague" Charter withou_ accompanying starting policies, in hopes that those will come later and appeal to all people. Under the time pressure, we were not able to develop a full set of policies, thus some of the major points had to be included in the charter.

(2) line 249-254. This is not a bad idea and forces CC members to engage. But it also requires a way to establish who is actually there in person (easy) and on call (less easy). With the inflated CC members this can take quite some time. It also does not protect from members that dial in and go to sleep.

All major votes will be electronic, and thus participation will be easy to trace; and if someone falls asleep during minutes adoption – the damage is minimal.

(3) Composition. I truly appreciate that larger groups have more votes (in limit) but I still think that this should be applied to the weight of *one* representative. Inflating the CC is not a good idea. At some point bodies become too large to function at east in a reasonable time frame. Also, it is quite common that in large groups, the group votes and the various topics upfront and the CC rep votes then accordingly.
One can easily keep this at one rep per institution.

OE: We do not expect a major inflation from this implementation – we are likely talking about only a few national labs, so just a handful of additional reps. For large groups, having a single weighted vote could also create a problem in case of the split decisions (a-la US-elections, when 51% vote within the group gets you 100% votes outside). We also anticipate that within these large groups some internal divisions are already in place, and having their own representation to EPIC is most practical.

(4) 6. Spokesperson. I understand that there is debate about the number but let me make a pitch for a single spokesperson at the beginning. Later once operation starts, I think a model with one spokesperson focusing more on operation and the other more on the physics output works then. I think right now the buck has to stop somewhere and hard decisions have to be made. With a good deputy this is not a problem. It works successfully for collaboration far larger and complex than us.

This has been adopted.

(5) There is no word (at least I do not find it) on the requirement of the presence of the spokesperson on site. At RHIC we were lucky as most spokespersons were from BNL or form places close by (commuter distance) but we had one case where this was not true and it was not good. Many will confirm this. I know BNL is not CERN and they won't pay the salary as CERN does but I think you cannot run a collaboration from afar. Spokesperson is a big commitment and being on site for a considerable fraction seems an appropriate condition that should be added to the charter.

Some language has been added to encourage this. Also, the required management plan for spokesperson candidates should cover "expected on-site presence". The collaboration can decide accordingly.

(6) I like the 2 years since this allows university faculty to take on the job. Asking a chairman for 2 years reduced responsibilities at a university is possible, 3 is less likely. This was also the reason why CMS decided to go with 2 years and it works.

Thanks for the input.

(7) is there a list of what policies are planned?

Some anticipated policies are mentioned throughout the charter (Code of conduct, Membership, Publication, etc.). We hope this would be one of the first Council tasks to put forward teams to develop those (and any additional policies they feel are needed)

Wlodek G

I do have three comments at this time:

Line 56 on relationship between the collaboration and the project. I would expect that it is the collaboration that is responsible for both design and construction of the EPIC detector. I do agree that there is a relationship to the project but the responsibility for the construction is that of the collaboration. I am also not sure that EPIC can determine what its relationship to the project is. Such relationship should be negotiated and agreed on with the project. Hence the rest of that paragraph I would interpret as the wishes of the EPIC experiment.

We agree that the EPIC charter has limited scope. We hope for a productive cooperative relationship with the project (and improved the text).

line 229 - Robert's Rules of Order. Has anyone read those rules and is able to explain how those rules apply to EPIC collaboration? Those Robert's Rules of Order are not simple and one needs a parliamentarian to explain.As such Robert's Rules of Order are not practical. I think one can adopt some rules and spell them exactly.

There is a built-in flexibility in the Charter to only invoke RoR in the difficult discussions/situations, for which RoR are used successfully by other governing bodies/Councils (example: STAR Council). RoR are time-tested and have a vast set of possibilities addressed. It is impractical to attempt to develop a new set of rules just for EPIC.

Regarding the spokesperson(s). During the construction phase short terms are not practical, in particular two-year term only without commitment for the second term would not allow enough continuity for the experiment in the construction phase to successful. Many experiments in the past had one spokesperson for the duration of the construction. This maybe too long of a term for the EPIC detector but tow years and then a change is not sufficient in my opinion.

So much for now, again hope that the deadline is extended, Wlodek

Two 2-year terms (so 4 total) are allowed by the Charter; this should provide sufficient continuation of leadership. Putting forward long terms (especially "for the duration of construction") immediately excludes all faculty members and most international collaborators from a potential candidate pool.

Kong T
- 4.1
If I understand correctly, each institute has to have 2 PIs, or it has to have 2 scientists that are not students or postdocs. If this is what it means, I do not agree with this typical requirement. However, I do understand the need and benefit of having two, which makes it easier to maintain the institutional contribution, responsibility, etc.

My argument against this is that a young scientist or even senior-level scientist can go to an institution that is not part of the EPIC collaboration. Generally, it's a good thing that EPIC has expanded, both for the Collaboration, the institute, and the individual. However, because the institution has no existing membership with EPIC, they will never have 2 before they can have 1. So they can never (or very difficult to) join unless the institution hires two! Practically, this is true already for many collaborations.

In other words, there is a huge bias or unequal opportunity for people who want to establish a new group. For example, if I want to join an institution that has a large population of underrepresented minorities or an institution that is not at the top of research, statistically, they are less likely to be an EPIC member institute already. This policy makes it harder for them and creates an implicit, if not explicit, bias. This also goes directly against our own value of DEI.

My suggestion is, instead of banning this kind of activity, we should in fact encourage them! However, existing (strong) member institutes should step in and help them; Just like a new faculty usually has a mentor in the department to help them get tenured, a new member institute with 1 PI at the beginning should also have another "mentor" institute from the Collaboration. The mentor institute can vouch for them, share responsibility and resources, and so on, until the new member establishes and thrives. Details of this rule/policy can be thought through, but the idea is not hard to understand. (This is not uncommon in other industries, one can look up how to make partner in a consultant firm, in a venture capital firm, etc. This is the same.

Two PhD-level scientists could be faculty/scientist + postdoc. Additionally, this is why we added "typically" – the Council has a flexibility to accept a group with single PI if the individual presents a viable plan.

4.3 - 4.4
The ideology, code of conduct, and values (e.g., Chapter 3) from the Charter writing have implicitly and explicitly expressed the need of equity, integrity, diversity, etc. However, it is a direct contradiction to me that in Chap. 4.3-4.4, the Collaboration divides members into groups that have unequal rights in the first place. I would be fine that in order to be a

member, certain requirements are needed, e.g., services. They can also depend on the duration, academic levels, etc. But they shouldn't be members and "good standing" members, where "good standing" members have additional benefits.

Membership rights that are different for "members" and "members in good standing" have no connection to where the members come from, their race, gender, or other identifying feature. It is simply defined by the requirement to do work for EPIC, which is common for all.

Therefore,
1. I disagree with this policy or at least the name or description of the policy, although I understand the good intention behind it.

2. Defining what is "good standing" and what not are practically too difficult and cannot be quantified.

3. For example, membership in good standing has eligibility to serve as conveners, give talks, name on the papers, while general members can only access data and so on. My impression from the writing is, if a member is not in a good standing, they won't be able to become an author on EPIC papers. Then what's the meaning of accessing data? This simply makes no sense.

4. If we are going to define "rights" of EPIC members, e.g., Chapter 4.4, it has to be an equal right from the beginning. However, it doesn't mean we should not have a rewarding, penalty, or "priority" mechanism. Obviously people who work more and contribute more should be rewarded. The opposite is true too.

In all the collaborations we surveyed there are "service work" requirements, and these are not in any contradiction with Equity, Diversity and Inclusion principles.

6. Spokesperson.

I strongly support only one spokesperson.

Many people have provided great arguments already so I won't repeat them. What I want to add is, if we take a look at the existing Working Group Conveners (4 for each group), although not every group is bad, there are disasters. Not to mention how inefficient this setup is.

Adopted.

Thomas U

I think neither in history nor in current days do 'triumvirates' work. That's why there is one president, one chancellor, on CEO, one dean, one provost, one director.

I think the 'less load' argument is dangerous as it could make people feel one can do that all on the fly and as a sidejob. I think it should be a commitment.

Again, I see that for a running experiment, two could be an option but three is suboptimal.
Single spokesperson route is adopted.

Elke A.

I agree with thomas, being a spokesperson is work and people should see it like this most university give a sabbatical for people who become a spokesperson. Also are the deputies not there to share workload. I also cannot see how one would get every two years 3 people who are qualified to run.
I really think this idea is not workable and should be dropped.
Single spokesperson route is adopted.

Brian P
My 'vote' is for a single spokesperson. Deputy(s) can be chosen by the spokesperson after the election and, along with the rest of the executive committee, be ratified by the CC.

The only caveat would be during the construction phase if we want another 'spokesperson-level' position to be an overall point-of-contact with the project. As I understand, various subsystem experts from the collaboration will become L3+ managers within the WBS but do we need someone from the collaboration side to have a global view and communicate with the project director? If we want such a position, that person would not necessarily have to be the spokesperson.
Single spokesperson route is adopted.

Dave M
For obvious reasons, I think a two-person co-spokesperson arrangement can be quite effective. In PHENIX, before Jamie Nagle and I were elected co-spokespersons, concerns were aired in the collaboration about how decisions would be made and where "the buck" would stop. I'm not saying those were silly concerns - not at all - but in practice it was never a problem. A collaboration is built on developing consensus, and maybe it's a good thing for the consensus building to begin at the top. Anyway, I think it's a bit of a bogeyman.

Perhaps the ideal arrangement *would* be a single spokesperson from a major University. I mean, it sounds good to me. And I agree aspokesperson should be resident at BNL nearly all of the time. There's just too much important information that flows informally through hallway chatter for an absentee landlord to be completely plugged in. A two- or three-year term seems about right. If EPIC only allows for the option of a single spokesperson I think you'll close yourself off from some really compelling candidates. I'm sure there are a number of energetic young professors in EIC-land who would do the collaboration a great service as

a spokesperson. But maybe they have young kids. Or kids of any age in school. Or a working spouse who can't relocate. Or elderly parents they help care for. Taken together, those considerations could cause a potentially excellent candidate to opt out of consideration as a single spokesperson. We're no longer in the olden times when it was assumed that someone would naturally jump at the chance to uproot their family for this kind of position.

You might say "Well, that person could be a deputy spokesperson." Sure, but you'd also be saying they couldn't be spokesperson. To me, that seems anti-DEI.

OTOH, I don't think you'd want a sole spokesperson who's a BNL or JLab staff member. I think you do need an independent voice to articulate the scientific interests of the collaboration without any appearance of compromise due to their employment.

I would allow the possibility of a co-spokesperson. The collaboration should then look at the slate of candidates for a particular spokesperson election and choose the best option. Might be a single spokesperson, might be a co-spokesperson team.

Thank you for the discussion. By the majority preference, a single spokesperson route is adopted.

Daniel Tapia Takaki

We find that the terms of office are too short. We do not like the 2+2 years mandate. Given the typical times scales in such large experiments under development, the spokesperson and collaboration board chair need a 3 years term, with no possibility for extension. Once the experiment is running mode, we would suggest a 2-years term without any extension.

Two 2-year terms are allowed by the Charter; this should provide sufficient continuation of leadership. Putting forward long terms immediately excludes all faculty members and most international collaborators from the potential candidate pool.

Summary of Comments on EPIC_Charter-v0.3 JGL comments -John Lajoie.pdf
Page: 4
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:30:20 AM
just Collaboration Council -adding the "Board" makes it confusing, it sounds like this is a sub-entity of the CC
Fixed.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:19:16 AM
Thi sentence seems to imply that the project has an oversight role over the collaboration and is inconsistent with the statement above that the Project is a partner.

I tried re-wording this sentence, but I actually think the paragraph is best with it left out. Stating the EIC Project is a partner above is sufficient.

Noted.

Page: 7
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:26:29 AM
Not sure what this means, maybe "since this isn't part of the original charter"?

Rephrased.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:27:26 AM
-    Publication Committee

Fixed.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:28:53 AM
Spokesperson(s)
(Depending on where the committee eventually comes down on spokesperson teams)

Single spokesperson route is adopted. Capitalization is fixed.

Page: 10
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:35:47 AM
During the discussions in the CC meeting on 10/14 there was a suggestion to make the Elections Committee a standing committee. I agree with that proposal.

Adopted

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:34:31 AM
Page: 11
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:37:42 AM
While the survey will ultimately determine the outcome, it only seems consistent to allow teams of co-spokespersons, given the emphasis on distributed leadership already in the charter.

From a practical standpoint it doesn't matter much -a competent spokesperson can arrange their deputies and the Executive Board to achieve the same effect.

Single spokesperson route is adopted.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:41:28 AM
I think the intent of this is to prevent someone from using a change in team composition to get around the term limits.

Why not just say "No individual, either alone or as part of a team, may serve as Spokesperson for more than two terms. " You could eliminate this sentence and add the above to Section 7.

The single spokesperson route is adopted.

Page: 12
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:42:46 AM
Is this the intent? Or do you mean two consecutive terms?
I think a two-term consecutive limit for the EB is more appropriate.
Consistently through the Charter, there is a maximum of two terms for all elected positions, regardless of served consequently or not.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:43:07 AM
Make standing
Adopted.

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:45:23 AM
I am worried this might be a high bar to reach and paralyze the Collaboration when making difficult decision. If a 2/3 Quorum is already required then I think a 2/3 of all voting members is sufficient.
We believe that just a ⅔ quorum is not enough to ensure broad support of the Council (say, 5 people vote in favor, the rest - abstain because they do not not support the move but do not want to be "as harsh"). In practice (as a previous Council chair for STAR, where this threshold is set at ¾) it may only put an additional load on the CC chair to reach out to people to do their job and cast the vote. In my 4-year experience with multiple groups admitted, we have never failed an institute admission because of shortage of votes.

Page: 13
Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:46:31 AM
...once on the ballot for spokesperson(s) in a given election.
Removed (no longer a relevant restriction).

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:48:15 AM
It seems odd to single out spokesperson teams for this special requirement. Previously in the document (Section 5.1) this was presented as a requirement of the Spokesperon(s). I would keep this general and not single out teams for this treatment.
Rephrased

Author: John Lajoie Subject: Highlight Date: 10/17/2022 8:49:16 AM
I agree with this as stated -this should two total, consecutive or non-consecutive.
Noted.

Silvia Dalla Torre

1 Introduction

- lines 48-49:

... the principal representative of the Collaboration in interactions with BNL
and DOE and ...

-->

... the principal representative of the Collaboration in interactions with BNL,
Jlab and DOE and ...

Added.

- line 50:

Collaboration Council Board

-->

Collaboration Council
[this to be consistent with the text above, where this body is called
Collaboration Council without adding the world board]

Fixed.

2 Relationship between the Collaboration and EIC Project
line 62:

While unforeseen requirements ...

-->

While requirements ...
[unforeseen is restrictive and there is no need for this word]

The text has been improved.

-lines 62-62:

"This may even necessitate the Spokesperson(s) to call for a Collaboration Council vote,
especially if the change is perceived to substantially modify the physics capabilities of EPIC.
"

I do not see the need of this statement: I would remove it.
In fact, the Council is the decision-maker of the EPIC policy.
Therefore, obviously, any relevant question related to the detector has to be discussed and
decided within the Council. Underlining it here is not needed and can look aggressive
towards the project, while this section is about constructive relationships between the
collaboration and the project.

The text has been improved.

3 Community Values
- lines 82-82:

To establish and maintain a welcoming, inclusive environment, every member ...

-->

To establish and maintain a welcoming, inclusive environment and high scientific standard,
every member ...

Adopted

4 Membership
- lines 100-102:
"Although the exact standing of an individual member, e.g. their authorship
status, depends in part on their satisfaction of collaboration requirements, the standing of all
members in a group can be affected by the fulfillment of group-wide obligations."
I suggest to make it more explicit because the groups are expected to fulfill their obligation
and this can affect the status of the group members.

This is the intent of this phrase, but further details are left to the
membership policy.

- lines 104-105
"However, qualification for authorship on publications may be modified in the future."
The "signature matter" being (obviously) subject to modifications due to the activity evolution,
I suggest to have it in a policy document and not in the Charter.

We left all details to the subsequent policies. However, we believe that
putting the notion that "authorship rights" require contributions to EPIC is
an important part of the Charter.

- lines 110-111:
In the introduction, we read:
"The Executive Board is concerned with the day-to-day operation of the Collaboration and
serves as the advisory body to the Spokesperson(s)." Therefore, the Executive Board is
advisory and, even if very relevant for the management of the Collaboration, technically it is
NOT part of the management.
Therefore, for consistency of the document, I suggest this modification:
... after a proposal made to the Collaboration management (Spokesperson(s) and Executive
Board).
-->
after a proposal made to the Spokesperson(s) in consultation with the Executive Board.

Rephrased to "Spokesperson and Executive Board"

- lines 114-115:
"Institutions may choose to leave the collaboration anytime, upon which their responsibilities
may need to be reallocated to other institutions."
I suggest to add here that, when an Institution chooses to leave the Collaboration,
the contributions already provided to the Collaboration remain property of the Collaboration.
Otherwise, if they leave with the staff they have provided so far, this is a deliberate damage
of the Collaboration as a whole.

It is impossible to mandate such transfer in this Charter, as it may
contradict the internal policies of individual Institutions.

- line 142:
Eligibility to serve as technical or physics group convenors or subconvenors.
-->

Eligibility to serve in all Collaboration role and bodies.
[In fact, the collaboration may need to evolve from WGs to different technical or
physics-related bodies: I prefer a more inclusive statement]
Expanded to include the proposal.

4.5 Authorship
The whole sub-section should be part of a dedicated policy.
In any case, I believe that the first statement in this sub-section, is misleading. It is written:
"Authorship policies will be the responsibility of Publication Committee."

This should be:
"The application of the authorship policies, defined in a specific policy document,
will be the responsibility of the Publication Committee."
Adopted

5 Collaboration Council
- lines 179-181
endorsement, upon proposal by the Executive Board of major roles in the Collaboration
including for example Physics Coordinator, Technical Coordinator, Working Group
conveners.
-->
endorsement, upon proposal by the Spokesperson(s) in consultation with
the Executive Board of major roles in the Collaboration including for example Physics
Coordinator, Technical Coordinator, Working Group conveners
[Comment - again for consistency: if EB is a consultive body, it has to act as a consultancy
body]
Agreed, adopted

- lines 202-203
"The Collaboration Council shall have at maximum two elected co-chairs drawn among its
members."
The Charter should not foresee two options; it should state clearly if one chair or 2 co-chairs.
Personally, I am in favour of 2 co-chairs.
What written in these lines is non-consistent with what written in section 7, where a chair and
a Vice-Chair are foreseen ...
same comment for lines 403-404 , where the same concept is repeated
The chair-line arrangement was broadly supported; the text is modified
to make this clearer.

-line 229
"Robert's Rules of Order"
**this expression is not internationally well know: it should be replace with a piece of
text that can be immediately clear to all collaboration members**
A footnote has been added

- lines 272-273

The Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee prepares and maintains the
Collaboration Code of Conduct (CoC).
-->
The Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Committee proposes the Collaboration
Code of Conduct (CoC), which is approved by the CC, and is in charge of maintaining it.
[the CC approval is mandatory for so important an item!]
Adopted - we expect all policies to be adopted/approved by the Council.

- lines 276-277
... such as career status, regional representation, ethnicity, sexual
identity and orientation, etc.
the example of sexual identity is problematic because it is not correct to ask the colleagues
about their sexual identity and orientation; on the contrary, there is a missing example that I
suggest to add:
race
We would prefer to avoid "race" and instead refer to "ethnicity". While we
can not ask colleagues about their gender identity or sexual orientation,
many people do disclose this information and make it part of their public
persona. This paragraph is recognizing that such a person would add to
the diversity of the DEI committee, not a statement requiring disclosure.
Also, we feel it is appropriate to acknowledge someone who is outwardly
a member of the LGBTQ+ community.

 6 Spokesperson(s) and Executive Board
lines 325-327
"In case the composition of a team of spokespersons changes for the second term, none of
their members is eligible for the following term."
I suggest to remove this restriction. The motivations to form a new team by a member
already serving in the previous term can be many. The leaving member can leave because
of health, divergences of opinion, new professional obligations, etc.
Also, the continuation of a member of a previous team can be beneficial to the collaboration.
Removed; no longer relevant.

Douglas Higinbotham

Markus:
Generic comment on managing structure:
• I propose to have a management board instead of spokespersons. The management board
would have a spokesperson, an analysis coordinator, and a technical coordinator. • The
analysis coordinator would coordinate physics studies with the PWGs. • The technical
coordinator would be in the current state the liaison between the EIC project and would
coordinate the detector studies with the DWGs.
• The analysis or technical coordinator could be acting spokesperson if the spokesperson is
not available.

• Other coordinators, e.g., a run coordinator, can be added at a later stage.

Thank you for the discussion. The single spokesperson option was clearly preferred by majority and is now adopted. The EB will serve the purpose of the management board you describe.

Generic comment on relationship between collaboration between EPIC and EIC project:
• I would rewrite the section. It should be clear that the collaboration supports the realization of the EIC project detector and works together with the EIC project, not separate as the section could be interpreted. There needs to be a memorandum of understanding of roles and collaboration between the EPIC and EIC project. That is missing.

The text has been improved with more emphasis on collaboration. It is impossible for the EPIC charter to mandate a memorandum of understanding with the project.

Detailed comments:
L47–49:
Add Jefferson Lab
The Spokesperson(s) is the principal representative of the Collaboration in interactions with BNL, Jefferson Lab, and DOE and its committees, the broader physics community, and the general public.

Added.

Maybe also in L35:
Remove Brookhaven Lab
(…) Electron-Ion Collider (EIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Or also add Jefferson Lab
(…) Electron-Ion Collider (EIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL), jointly realized by BNL and Jefferson Lab.

Adopted.

Rolf Ent:

To me the largest issues are
• the model of spokesperson with deputy spokespersons seems to me cleaner than the model of multiple spokespersons. In the former you have much more a chance for clear leadership roles and transition of knowledge planning.

Adopted.

• "However, in their oversight role, the EIC Project is not part of the collaboration, nor does it bear direct responsibility to EPIC management. While unforeseen requirements from the EIC Project may require modifications to the detector design, the Collaboration will reserve the option to review technical proposals made by the EIC Project and report their finding to the EIC project. This may even necessitate the Spokesperson(s) to call for a Collaboration Council vote, especially if the change is perceived to substantially modify the physics

capabilities of EPIC." Even if the former seems fine and I understand the rationale, the last sentence raises red flags. What threshold will be used? If for every item this evokes a vote, one gets an unworkable and unpleasant situation. If we start the whole process without some trust and appreciation for the value of a working together of the Collaboration and the Project, we are on the wrong track. Plus in reality it is an accountability issue. I would just remove the sentence starting with "This may..." completely, or alternatively rephrase as: "If the change is perceived to substantially modify the physics capabilities of EPIC, the Spokesperson(s) may call for a Collaboration Council vote that requires super-majority." The super-majority just to add some level of threshold of the substantially modify.

The text has been improved with more emphasis on a partnership environment.

EPIC_charter_v0p3_comments_AlexJentsch - Peter Steinberg
Section 1:
No red flags

OK!

Section 2:
Lines 57-60:
The EIC project has this mandate, not the collaboration. I think the wording should be closer to the following: "The EIC Project is responsible – with advice and scientific input from the Collaboration (which also includes personnel from the EIC Project) – for delivering an EIC detector which achieves the EIC physics programmatic goals…"

The Project is responsible for the deliverables, but it's the collaboration that will be building the detector, which could not be ignored.

I think in general, section 2 sets a tone which adds to the confusion people have about the two bodies, the Collaboration and Project, and what each is responsible for.

The text has been improved with more emphasis on a partnership environment.

Section 3:
Line 77:
Simple or super-majority? We specify it elsewhere in the document, so we should do so here as well.

Clarified

Line 87:
Crucial, or mandatory? The tone shifts here to "we need", when the adoption of the CoC requires a vote. "We need" should become "it is required".

Text was improved

Line 96:

Specify "PhD-level" – usually one professor and postdoc, or something similar.
This is the intent. We kept the original text to be inclusive of different countries/customs with a different degree designations.

Section 4:
Line 105:
May be modified via Policy, or charter change? I only ask because there is a distinction given in Section 1, so we should at least comment how this could be modified.
No changes. The Charter already states that only Charter modification requires a supermajority vote while ALL policies can be modified by a simple majority decision.

Lines 106-107:
Doesn't this contradict the statement in the opening of the section? Does participating simply mean "attending meetings"? What if they do not have two "PhD-Level" scientists, but are currently "participating"? This, plus the lines below (109-114) imply a different bar for the initial members, and the ones which might follow right after.
We propose to include everyone who was active in EPIC in any form on the moment of Charter adoption. The provision of "typically two PhD" allows such a move without violating the charter. It is up to the Membership Committee (and later Council consideration) to review the groups' participation and status, as set in the Charter.

Shouldn't we consider a different set of criteria during the CD-2/3a phase while we are ramping up people-power to complete tasks? E.g., maybe give everyone contributing to a task which helps achieve the goals of the construction membership status?
This is left to the Membership policy for most flexibility/easy evolution with the evolution of EPIC itself.

Line 116:
Any institution choosing to leave who has a substantial role in a task should "require" a CC meeting to determine how to reallocate the tasks. Otherwise, the labs potentially end up getting stuck with much of the work.
This should be handled through the Spokesperson and could be spelled out in the Operational Policy, not the Charter.

Line 122:
So does the management team have the power to NOT bring a potentially dismissible offense to a vote? Are they the gatekeepers on this, or this there a rubric we will have to

determine if there is credibility to a complaint to necessitate a vote? Shouldn't we have requirements for fact-finding which can inform such a decision?

Text was modified, leaving the details of the procedures to the CoC policy

Section 4.3 overall:
This section seems to kind of be appended here awkwardly. I understand being vague, but didn't we already outline in the previous sections what good standing looks like? Why not say:

"Collaboration members must adhere to the CoC and rules for institutional membership to be considered in 'good standing'. In addition, 'good standing' may be amended at a later date, with approval by the CC, which enhance the requirements to include additional components, e.g. shift taking, service work, etc. Maintenance of these requirements by collaborating institutions will be evaluated on a yearly basis by a Membership Committee."

We believe the text is clear.

One 151-156:
This is more in-line with what I mentioned above, and seems to make my point for me. It seems the goal posts are being moved from section to section. To me, an author can ONLY be a MGS. So, defining an author separate from a MGS seems redundant. No one would care to be a MGS and NOT an author. I would say that these sections should be reorganized to emphasize the point that people would most care about.

As per Charter daft, MGS status is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for authorship.

Section 5, 6, and 7:
Having one spokesperson, with a deputy, makes the most sense to me. This means that the roles/tasks of the spokesperson/deputy should be well-defined. I like the idea of a "ticket" which includes a spokesperson + deputy team, so we know those people are okay to work together, but also so the collaboration know what other person they are tacitly voting for (in other words, I don't think a post-election "selection" of a deputy should happen). In principle, the deputy's job should be to do much of the administrative work required of the spokesperson's office, but ultimately the delegation of specific tasks should be decided by the team. The ultimate responsibility of the office falls to the spokesperson.

A single spokesperson route is now adopted.

Overall, the structure of the CC and the associated functions seem reasonable.

Noted.

Line 227:
"…professional and collegial manner…" -> "…must adhere to the code of conduct…"

The text has been kept as is: adherence to the CoC is a mandatory requirement for ALL members of EPIC; no need to repeat this for the Institutional Representatives.

Summary of Comments on EPIC_Charter-v0.3_commentedDSAFFB - Francesco Bossù

Page: 1 Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
General note: capitalisations need to be standardised across the document, as well as the use of acronyms — some are defined several times.
We have done our best to address this.

Page: 4 Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
should there be a definition of what is meant by a super-majority at this stage?
The text clearly states "detailed in the Voting and Elections provisions of this charter;" this is where all the voting rules are consolidated and definitions are provided.

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- for the
- of
- fulfills
- oversight
- towards
Added

Page: 5
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
repeated twice
Fixed

Author: fbossu Date: 10/20/2022 2:38:50 AM
-isn't "tipically" a bit vague for a collaboration that is not yet formed?
-as for now, this sentence allows institutions lead by just two short term post-docs to be part of it.
This endanger long(er) term plans with such institution
This is intentional. It will be up to the Council to consider all aspects of Institutional applications from new groups to decide if it warrants admission.

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
meaning of group should be defined — is this the group of members from each institution?
Added

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM

-   in
Fixed

Page: 6
Author: FRANCISCO Audrey Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
-   should more details be given about what the formation consists of?
This is given in a previous sentence.Clarification added

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
should this state how many weeks / days they should be submitted before a CC meeting?
Added "at least two weeks in advance," similar to the vote announcements

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
"These proposals can include"
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
What constitutes CC management? Spokesperson(s)?
This meant to refer to the Council (co)Chairs. Made more clear with "CC leadership"

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
Dismissal proposals
OK

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
Who is meant by EPIC management here?
changed to "EPIC CC" – membership matters belong to the Council

Author: FRANCISCO Audrey Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
who constitues EPIC management in this sense? Spokespeople? Executive board? CC?
Changed to "EPIC CC" – membership matters belong to the Council

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
-   :
Added

Page: 7
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
This last point appears to be the same as the last bullet point above
Agreed. Removed.

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
-   the
Added

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
-   what isn't? The PC?
Authorship requirements. Clarified.

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- also

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- 6 months at full FTE?
Left open; this is for Pub. Committee to propose and the CC to decide.

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- a
Added

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- s
Added

Author: fbossu Date: 10/20/2022 2:44:31 AM
- will the exhaustive list be defined in a separate document?
This is left up to the Council, who could develop additional policies

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- capitalise
Done

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- the
Done

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- should it be defined which?
Added "at large" and "as described below"

Page: 8
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- ,
Added

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM

Author: FRANCISCO Audrey Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- how is this committee composed? internal or external members?
This has been clarified, "standing Elections Committee," description follows in the appropriate section

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- so is it one chair plus two co-chairs, or just two co-chairs? Seems ambiguous
The elected person starts as a vice-chair, then turns to chair ("chair-line"); text is improved

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- at-large should be hyphenated
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- CC
Fixed

Page: 9
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- -
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- Spokesperson should either be capitalised everywhere or nowhere
Fix attempted

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- should this be referenced?
Left as is (based on other charter examples)

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- weeks'
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- Council
Added

Author: FRANCISCO Audrey Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- capitalization
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- of
Not accepted; correct as worded

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- This penalises the whole institution. Would it not be more constructive to require a change of that institution's rep, instead of the public shaming? All the institution's members should be informed, though.
The text is kept. Since the Institution appoints their own representative, it's their duty (and advantage) of selecting a responsible person. Keeping voting rights for inactive members penalizes the whole collaboration, halting the Council business. We agree that the Institutions should be informed of such action

Page: 10
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- "Role" makes it sound like the actual role rather than the person occupying it is being dismissed. I don't think "role" is necessary here.
Agreed. Removed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- space
Fixed

Page: 11
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- capitalise?
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- capitalization
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- to
Fixed

Page: 12
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- three
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- routine
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- should there also be a minimum quorum?
Quorum requirements are specified for all major decisions. "Routine decisions" (e.g., adopting minutes, will not have quorum requirement).

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- s
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- It solicits
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- s
Fixed

Page: 13
Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- s
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- the
Fixed

Author: Daria Date: 10/20/2022 4:54:24 AM
- s
Fixed