

ePIC membership committee update

Peter Steinberg & Pietro Antonioli for the eMC
12 Jan 2024
ePIC collaboration meeting, Argonne



Committee activity

- **Membership finalized after CC vote (thanks!)**
 - Peter Steinberg (BNL)
 - Pietro Antonioli (INFN)
 - Friederike Bock (ORNL)
 - Helen Caines (Yale Univ.)
 - Doug Higinbotham (JLab)
 - Bedanga Mohanty (NISER)
 - Silvia Niccolai (CNRS/INP2P3)
 - Marzia Rosati (Iowa State Univ.)
- **Met twice in December (11th and 18th)**
 - New indico category (<https://indico.bnl.gov/category/532/>)
- **Started developing policy outline**
 - Google doc - still within the committee for now
- **Today we remind you the basic structure of membership in ePIC and highlight some of the points of debate within the committee + next steps foreseen**
 - Input from the CC is quite valuable at this point

eMC charge in ePIC charter

- **In the ePIC charter (v1.0) the role of the Membership Committee (eMC) is:**
 - Responsible for the development of the ePIC membership policy and oversight of its fair implementation (charter section 5.5)
 - Membership policy defines process for establishing and maintaining “good standing” status for institutes and collaboration members and minimum requirements for authorship status
 - Committee assists council in developing -- and enforcing -- the membership policy

Current situation and goals for future

- **After ePIC charter endorsement, all active groups were admitted to ePIC**
 - All are assumed to have good standing at present
- **In steady state, we expect for groups:**
 - Institutes are members immediately after admission
 - Institutes have good standing after submission and approval of an institutional plan
 - *Plan will include individuals, and specific activities associated with each of them*
 - *Criteria for overall approval will be listed in policy, and will evolve over time*
 - Institutes will be reviewed on annual basis
 - *Typically, good standing will be maintained without incident*
 - *Exceptions will be flagged by eMC and reported to CC (via chairs)*
- **ePIC charter also mentions individual good standing, but the details have been left for the membership policy**
 - A topic of active debate!

Individual vs. group

- **ePIC charter requires that should be a process to bestow good standing on individuals, and not just their institute**
 - Our discussions found this to be a concern for small institutions where groups are still in transition to the EIC from other research areas
- **We expect a *staged approach*, with lower threshold for individual good standing now, but one that will grow in the future**
 - Senior members could have somewhat different requirements provided they provide meaningful support to ePIC effort at their institute, and are responsive to collaboration (e.g. CC voting)
 - Engineers and technicians envisioned to contribute to group contributions, but we do not expect them to be considered signing authors except in special cases
- **A key point is ePIC needs institutions to account for the individuals in their groups**
 - We will be providing a way for groups to report on the work performed by their members
 - This will include 1) progress made over the previous period, 2) plans for the next
- **So while the information on individual activities will definitely be required starting this year, the way we use that information will evolve**
 - As we reach operations, expect stricter requirements on individual contributions, e.g. technical tasks and shifts

Timeline for formalizing membership

Q1 2024	Q2 2024	Q3 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025	Q2 2025	Q3 2025	Q4 2025
ANL meeting	Policy approval		TDR completion		Group reviews		
	Group commitment						

**YOU ARE
HERE**

- **Draft release of membership policy after Argonne collaboration meeting**
 - Ideally March/April approval, or latest by Lehigh meeting
- **Provisional good standing given to all active groups**
 - As soon as membership policy is approved
- **Will concurrently (ASAP) solicit group commitment documentation, to be collected during Q2 2024**
 - Electronic form circulated to groups during Q1 2024
 - Deadline by end of Q2 2024
- **First institutional reviews planned in Q2/Q3 2025**
 - We will propose to have eMC manage this process for ePIC
 - Important decisions will be referred to CC (communicated via chairs)

Collaboration commitment form from CLAS

- Each institute provides list of members and FTE

[±] CLAS Membership:

Full Name	Academic Position	CLAS Membership Status	Time Share	Notes (Alt. Affil.)	Remarks
Michel Guidal	Senior Research Scientist	Full Member	0.01 %	Has left research for univ. admin., still CLAS member	
Silvia Niccolai	Senior Research Scientist	Full Member	100 %	n/a	

- They also provide two statements of service, one outlining work from the last year, and one prefiguring the work for the upcoming year

[±] CLAS Service work:

Category	Description	Contributor	FTE	Percentage Done	Documentation	Claimed FTE	Reviewed FTE or comments
Committee	SWC member	Adam Hobart	0.100	-	n/a	0.100	
Reviews	Continuation of DPWG analysis review	Carlos Munoz-Camacho	0.050	-	Review 9190756: "Measurement of the Deeply Virtual Compton Scattering Cross Section from the Proton at 10.6 GeV using the CLAS12 Detector"	0.050	

- On ePIC we plan to provide ways to directly link individuals to specific activity areas (detectors, physics, DAQ, software, publication, collaboration, etc.)
 - Will make the activity coordinators a key part of the membership process

Technical needs (aka 📞)

- **A database to keep track of individual members of ePIC is taking on increasing urgency**
 - Initial instance of ePIC phonebook (similar to EICUG) available, but not fully functional yet
 - CC maintains spreadsheets of institutional changes since CC formation but not members
 - Some short-term urgency from CC and management to get a full accounting of individuals in ePIC
- **Membership committee chairs are involved in discussions with SDCC at BNL to develop this**
 - We contributed to a full requirement document in collaboration with BNL SDCC
- **Aiming to get something ready in the short term, to address urgent needs**

We need your feedback!

- **This discussion is just to introduce you to what we plan to circulate in the coming several weeks**
- **We welcome feedback from the CC members, so we can make the membership policy reflect the needs of the ePIC collaboration**
- **Examples**
 - Do you agree with the proposed timelines?
 - Individual good standing vs. groups - how to achieve balance for different roles
 - How should membership policy evolve from now, through construction, and eventually operations?
 - *e.g. include explicit triggers in the policy document to reevaluate the policies as the experiment progresses through*
 - How should we account for non-scientific contributors, e.g. technicians, engineers, undergraduates?
 - Is there anything missing that the committee should discuss and potentially incorporate into the draft policy?
- **Email us at epic-cc-membership-committee-l@lists.bnl.gov!**
 - Private list, but we will get the messages