

ePIC Conference Policy

(DRAFT, April 19, 2024)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Table of Content

Section I: Introduction

I.1 Policy Scope and Goals

I.2 Definition of terms

I.3 Policy Revision

Section II: ePIC Conference and Talks Committee

II.1 Responsibilities

II.1.1 Chair and Vice Chair

II.1.2 Full Committee

II.2 Interactions with Other Standing Committees

II.2.1: Interaction with ePIC DEI Committee

II.2.2: Interaction with ePIC Membership Committee

II.2.3: Interaction with ePIC Publication Committee

Section III: ePIC Conference Presentations

III.1 Selection of Speakers

III.2 Direct Invitations

III.3 Conference Material Approval

III.3.1 Approving Entities

III.3.2 Approval Process

III.4 Presentation Rehearsal

III.5 Conference Material Archival

III.6 Other Presentations

Section IV: ePIC Results and Technical Drawings

IV.1 Designation of ePIC Results

IV.2 Labeling

IV.2.1 Labeling of ePIC Results

IV.2.2 Labeling of ePIC Technical Drawings

IV.3 ePIC Results and Technical Drawing Archival

34 **Section I: Introduction**

35

36 **I.1 Policy Scope and Goals**

37

38 Aligned with the mandates outlined in the ePIC Collaboration Charter, the ePIC Conference Policy
39 delineates the processes governing the speaker selection, quality assurance, approval, and
40 archival of conference abstracts and oral and poster presentations delivered at scientific
41 conferences, workshops, symposiums, schools, and similar scientific venues on behalf of the ePIC
42 Collaboration. Entrusted to the oversight and management of the ePIC Conference and Talks
43 Committee, this policy establishes procedures aimed at ensuring the equitable distribution of
44 presentations, maintaining internal quality standards, and fostering efficient review processes
45 within the ePIC Collaboration. The policy also recognizes that collaborators may present Public or
46 Published ePIC Results at different venues, such as seminars, colloquia, job interviews, funding
47 requests and reports, reviews, etc. These policies do not extend to monitoring these presentations;
48 however, general recommendations regarding these talks are provided.

49

50 The primary objectives of this policy are twofold: firstly, to expedite the dissemination of ePIC
51 Results deemed sound and presentation-ready by the ePIC Collaboration, and secondly, to uphold
52 rigorous quality assurance measures while ensuring equitable recognition of individual
53 contributions. By adhering to these guidelines, the ePIC Collaboration endeavors to enhance
54 transparency, collaboration, and professionalism in the communication of ePIC research outcomes.

55

56 **I.2 Definition of terms**

57

58 **ePIC Results** - any plots, tables, numbers, and/or formulas that arise from and/or are based on
59 ePIC (sub)detector simulations or ePIC (sub)detector beam or bench tests.

60 **Published ePIC Results** - ePIC Results that have been reviewed and approved according to the
61 ePIC Publication Policy and have been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. This
62 designation does not include Conference Proceedings that include Public ePIC Results.

63 **Public ePIC Results** - all ePIC Results that were approved for presentation outside the ePIC
64 Collaboration meetings and are not yet Published ePIC Results.

65 **ePIC Conference Presentations** - all invited and contributed oral and poster presentations of
66 ePIC results given by ePIC Collaboration Members at scientific conferences, workshops,
67 symposiums, schools, and similar scientific venues.

68

69 CTC - Conference and Talk Committee

70 CC - Collaboration Council

71 EICUG - Electron-Ion Collider Users Group

72 DEI - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

73

74 **I.3 Policy Revision**

75

76 This policy is intended to be revised every two years and the current version should be reviewed
77 and updated by the CTC no later than April 2026.

78

79 **Section II: ePIC Conference and Talks Committee**

80

81 **II.1 Responsibilities**

82

83 The responsibilities of the ePIC CTC are broadly outlined in the ePIC Collaboration Charter.

84 This section further elaborates on those responsibilities, summarizing the direct
85 implementations.

86

87 **II.1.1 Chair and Vice Chair**

- 88 ● **Act as point of contact and outreach to conference organizers:** The Chair and Vice
89 Chair serve as primary point of contact for external conferences and are encouraged to
90 reach out to relevant conference organizers to directly suggest ePIC-related presentations.
- 91 ● **Act as liaisons to the ePIC Collaboration and EICUG:** The Chair and Vice Chair facilitate
92 communication and collaboration between the CTC and various entities, including the ePIC
93 CC, Spokesperson's Office, other standing committees, and EICUG.
- 94 ● **Maintain and report speaker statistics:** The Chair and Vice Chair report speaker
95 statistics to the ePIC DEI Committee, the Collaboration Council, and the collaboration as a
96 whole at Collaboration meetings, at least annually.
- 97 ● **Promote diversity among committee members:** The Chair and Vice Chair should strive
98 to ensure diverse representation and expertise within the committee when nominating
99 members.

100 **II.1.2 Full Committee**

- 101 ● **Policy review:** The ePIC Conference Policy undergoes a comprehensive review every two
102 years. The ePIC CTC collaborates with the Collaboration Council to collect feedback and
103 implement necessary adjustments.
- 104 ● **Maintain a list of relevant conferences:** The ePIC CTC, in collaboration with the EICUG,
105 maintains a list of relevant conferences for the ePIC Collaboration community, facilitating
106 information dissemination and participation opportunities.
- 107 ● **Call for speaker nominations and selection process:** The ePIC CTC issues calls for
108 speaker nominations and oversees the selection process for ePIC Conference
109 Presentations, providing clear instructions, reviewing candidates, and making
110 recommendations based on the selection criteria defined in these policies.
- 111 ● **Maintain a list of speakers:** The committee curates a list of ePIC speakers and nominated
112 speaker candidates along with the rationale for their nominations.

- 113 ● **Presentation review assistance:** Committee members provide support to presenters and
114 approving entities throughout the review process, offering constructive feedback and
115 guidance on presentation content, clarity, and adherence to standards. They also ensure
116 compliance with policies regarding the preservation and accessibility of approved
117 presentation materials.

118 **II.2 Interactions with Other Standing Committees**

119

120 **II.2.1: Interaction with ePIC DEI Committee**

121 The CTC will actively seek advice from the ePIC DEI Committee through interactions with the CTC
122 DEI Committee Liaison. This collaboration will focus on:

- 123 ● **Nominations support and inclusive inreach strategies:** Collaborating on the
124 development and implementation of inclusive inreach strategies to ensure nominations for
125 a diverse pool of speakers. This includes ensuring representation across various
126 demographic categories such as gender, race, age, career stage, location, etc.
- 127 ● **Demographic review and identification of imbalances:** Reviewing with DEI Liaison
128 statistics on the demographics of selected and nominated speakers to assess the diversity
129 and inclusivity of the speaker pool, and identifying potential imbalances in speaker
130 selection based on tracked categories. This review is aimed at increasing the probability of
131 equitable representation and informs adjustments to the speaker selection process.
- 132 ● **Integration and improvement:** Integrating feedback from the ePIC DEI Committee into the
133 speaker selection process and all other activities of the ePIC CTC. This includes
134 establishing regular communication channels to exchange information, share updates, and
135 address any concerns or challenges related to diversity and inclusion efforts.

136 **II.2.2: Interaction with ePIC Membership Committee**

137 The CTC will collaborate with the ePIC Membership Committee as needed to ensure alignment
138 between speaker selection processes and membership policies. This may involve seeking advice
139 on the membership status of potential speakers or any aspect of this policy that intersects with
140 ePIC Membership Policies.

141 **II.2.3: Interaction with ePIC Publication Committee**

142 The CTC will collaborate with the Publication Committee to ensure coherence between conference
143 presentations and subsequent conference publications. This includes sharing information related
144 to public results, coordinating archiving efforts, and seeking advice as needed to maintain
145 alignment with ePIC Publication Policies.

146 **Section III: ePIC Conference Presentations**

147 **III.1 Selection of Speakers**

148 When selecting speakers to represent the ePIC Collaboration, the following guidelines and criteria
149 are considered by the ePIC CTC:

- 150 ● **Membership Standing:** Presenters should be members in good standing as defined by the
151 Charter and Membership Policy of the ePIC Collaboration.
- 152 ● **Criteria for Speaker Recommendation:** Criteria considered when recommending
153 speakers include:
 - 154 ○ Ability to speak knowledgeably on the particular topic,
 - 155 ○ Preference for the primary analyzer to present initial results, where reasonable,
 - 156 ○ Representation of gender, race, career stage, geographic location, and institutional
157 diversity within the collaboration,
 - 158 ○ Consideration of career status (early, mid, advanced career), including current
159 employment and career transitions,
 - 160 ○ History and number of previous talks given on behalf of ePIC,
 - 161 ○ Special criteria requested by conference organizers.
- 162 ● **Use of Judgment:** The ePIC CTC uses its best judgment in each case when deciding the
163 relative importance of these criteria.
- 164 ● **Nomination Process:** Nominations for speakers may come from any member of the
165 collaboration, including self-nominations and nominations from members of the ePIC CTC.
166 Nominating individuals should follow the instructions provided by the ePIC CTC regarding
167 the submission of nominations.
- 168 ● **Announcement of Speaker Recommendations:** After selecting a speaker, the ePIC CTC
169 recommendations will be posted on the collaboration's agreed platform as soon as the
170 speaker accepts the talk. This entails posting to the epic-talk mailing list and the [ePIC](#)
171 [Conference Wiki Page](#) and may be subject to potential changes upon the implementation of
172 the ePIC Collaboration documentation management system.

173 **III.2 Direct Invitations**

174 Collaborators receiving speaking invitations directly from conference organizers are expected to
175 inform the ePIC CTC of their intentions to accept or decline the invitation. If declining, they are
176 encouraged to refer the invitation to the ePIC CTC for possible reassignment to another ePIC
177 collaborator. If a conference organizer seeks advice on selecting an ePIC speaker from a
178 collaborator, the collaborator should refer the matter to the ePIC CTC.

179 III.3 Conference Material Approval

180 Members of the Collaboration who have been selected or directly invited for a presentation of ePIC
181 results are required to follow the approval process described in these guidelines. This
182 encompasses all invited and contributed ePIC Conference Presentations, covering conference
183 materials such as abstracts, posters, and oral presentation slides.

184 The conference materials should include the name of the presenter and the designation 'for the
185 ePIC Collaboration' to denote affiliation.

186 III.3.1 Approving Entities

187 The first step of the ePIC presentation approval process involves a review by the leaders of the
188 relevant working groups or detector subsystem collaborations, called first-step approving entities,
189 depending on the presentation's scope. This includes:

- 190 ● For presentations on physics topics: the conveners of the primary Physics Working Group.
- 191 ● For software and computing topics: the conveners of the primary Software Working Group.
- 192 ● For detector topics: Cross-Cutting Group conveners for broad detector subsystem overview
193 presentations or Detector Subsystem Leaders for specific detector subsystem
194 presentations.

195 The second step involves an open review process by the collaboration and final approval by the
196 appropriate ePIC Collaboration coordinators, called second-step approving entities.

- 197 ● For presentations on physics topics: the Analysis Coordinator(s).
- 198 ● For software and computing topics: the Software and Computing Coordinator(s).
- 199 ● For detector topics: the Technical Coordinator Office.

200 The ePIC CTC will direct presenters to the appropriate review entity in cases of non-obvious
201 cross-topic presentations. In the event of a disagreement between the ePIC CTC and the
202 presenter for a primarily working group or detector subsystem collaboration designation, the matter
203 will be directed to the CC leadership and the Spokesperson's Office for final decision.

204 Materials for general overview presentations regarding the ePIC detector, physics program, or
205 computing and software should be directly forwarded to the second step of the approval process.

206 III.3.2 Approval Process

- 207 ● Presenters are required to submit a draft of their presentation or abstract to the appropriate
208 working group for the first-step approval as defined in Section III.3.1 at least 14 weekdays
209 before the conference begins or before the abstract submission deadline. This currently
210 entails submission to the respective working group mailing list and may be subject to

211 potential changes upon the implementation of the ePIC Collaboration documentation
212 management system.

213 ● Presenters are encouraged to submit their materials well in advance of this deadline, if they
214 anticipate significant issues during the approval process. Any presentations submitted less
215 than 14 weekdays before the deadline may be subject to rejection by the first-step
216 reviewing group and withdrawal of the presentation from the conference.

217 ● Feedback on the presentation should be sent to both the presenter and the first-step
218 reviewing group. Each convener/leader of the reviewing group is expected to communicate
219 their decision on the presentation's approval or disapproval within one week of its posting.
220 Failure to respond within this timeframe will result in the convener's/leader's decision not
221 being considered for the approval or disapproval of the reviewed conference material.

222 ● In situations where two conveners/leaders within a reviewing group cannot reach a
223 consensus, the second-step approval entity will make a decision based on the available
224 information. In the case of three conveners/leaders within a reviewing group, the majority
225 opinion will determine the outcome. If no response is received from any convener/leader of
226 the reviewing group within 7 weekdays, the second-step approval entity will assume
227 responsibility of approving or disapproving the presentation.

228 ● If the first-step approval is granted, the presenter must post the complete
229 presentation/abstract to the collaboration's agreed platform at least 7 weekdays prior to the
230 start of the conference or the deadline for abstract submission. At the second step of the
231 review, comments are to be sent to the presenter with a copy to the collaboration's agreed
232 platform. This entails submission to the epic-talks mailing list and may be subject to
233 potential changes upon the implementation of the ePIC Collaboration documentation
234 management system.

235 ● Any suggested major revisions must be received within the first five days of this 7-weekday
236 period to be considered. It is understood that the initial and thorough review of
237 presentations occurs at the first step. The second-step approver should conduct a final
238 integrity check and ensure that relevant comments from the collaboration have been
239 incorporated. Upon conclusion of the process, the second-step approver should post a note
240 to the collaboration's agreed platform with the information that the presentation has been
241 approved (or disapproved).

242 ● Conference materials for general overview presentations on the ePIC detector, physics
243 program, or computing and software should be directed directly to the second step of the
244 approval process at least 7 weekdays prior to the start of the conference or deadline for
245 abstract submission. The authors of these conference materials are expected to engage in
246 active collaboration with working group conveners and detector subsystem leaders to
247 ensure the incorporation of the latest Public and Published ePIC Results and to validate
248 their interpretations and conclusions based on those results prior to submission for
249 approval.

- 250 ● The ePIC CTC should contribute to the review of the posted conference materials at the
251 second step of the open collaboration review to ensure alignment with collaboration
252 conference policies and standards.
- 253 ● In all instances, a decision to disapprove a presentation or abstract must be accompanied
254 by a supporting rationale for the disapproval and shared with the ePIC CTC.
- 255 ● In very rare and exceptional circumstances, the CTC retains the authority to recommend
256 veto or ultimate approval of conference material. Such occurrences are expected only in
257 extreme cases, and in such instances, the matter will be escalated to the CC leadership
258 and Spokesperson's Office for the final decision. The reasoning for any final veto decision
259 must be provided in writing by the CC leadership and Spokesperson's Office to the ePIC
260 CC.
- 261 ● The presenter is responsible for submitting the approved abstract and posting the
262 conference materials on the conference website in accordance with the conference's
263 instructions and deadlines.

264 **III.4 Presentation Rehearsal**

265

266 Presenters should rehearse their talk prior to the conference. Rehearsals should be organized
267 within their own institutions and/or the relevant detector subsystem collaboration or working group,
268 ensuring that the ePIC CC institutional representative or designated substitute is present.

269

270 **III.5 Conference Material Archival**

271

272 Approved talks and abstracts should be stored in a central location, which will ultimately be
273 managed by the ePIC Collaboration documentation management system. Until the ePIC
274 Collaboration documentation management system is ready, presenters must post the presentation
275 on [ePIC Wiki Conferences Page](#).

276

277 **III.6 Other Presentations**

278 In addition to the ePIC Conference Presentations, collaborators may present Public or Published
279 ePIC Results at various venues such as seminars, colloquia, job interviews, funding requests and
280 reports, reviews, etc. These policies do not extend to monitoring these presentations.

281 While these presentations may not formally represent ePIC, it is understood that the presenter is a
282 member of the ePIC Collaboration, and their affiliation with ePIC is clear to the audience.
283 Therefore, it is crucial to exercise caution when presenting ePIC Results and their interpretations,
284 ensuring accuracy and clarity to avoid misrepresentation.

285 Collaborators are encouraged to seek feedback from ePIC collaborators to ensure accuracy and
286 alignment with the collaboration standards, thereby contributing to collaboration cohesion.

287 Additionally, rehearsing these presentations with ePIC collaborators whenever possible is
288 recommended.

289 Adherence to these guidelines demonstrates a commitment to collaboration values and
290 professionalism.

291 **Section IV: ePIC Results and Technical Drawings**

292 As of the current policy, ePIC Results consist of simulations, beam and bench test data. This policy
293 is subject to revision in the future to encompass a broader range of results. The following
294 regulations pertain specifically to ePIC Results intended to be released for presentation outside of
295 ePIC Collaboration meetings.

296 **IV.1 Designation of ePIC Results**

297 For ePIC Results intended for presentations outside of ePIC Collaboration meetings, the decision
298 whether they are ready for Public designation is made by the relevant working group or detector
299 subsystem collaboration, based on the presentation's scope as defined in the first step of the ePIC
300 presentation approval process (Section III.3.1).

301 The Public Result designation indicates that the results are suitable for presentation outside the
302 ePIC Collaboration. If old results are re-plotted with additional information (like adding new data or
303 additional curves to the plot) this will require re-approval by the conveners/leaders.

304 In cases of disagreement between the presenter and the conveners/leaders or the ePIC CTC
305 regarding whether specific results qualify as ePIC Results for conference material approval
306 described in these policies, the matter will be referred to the CC leadership and the
307 Spokesperson's Office for the final decision.

308 The designation of Published ePIC Results is controlled by the ePIC Publication Policy. This
309 designation is reserved for ePIC Results that have been reviewed and approved according to the
310 ePIC Publication Policy and have been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. It does
311 not include Public ePIC Results published in conference proceedings. The ePIC Publication Policy
312 governs both the Published ePIC Results and the Public ePIC Results presented in conference
313 proceedings.

314 **IV.2 Labeling**

315 **IV.2.1 Labeling of ePIC Results**

316 For ePIC Results to be presented outside of ePIC Collaboration meetings, the following labeling
317 conventions should be adhered to:

- 318 ● Simulations: Results derived from the ePIC software stack and standalone ePIC subsystem
319 simulations should be labeled as "ePIC Simulation".
- 320 ● Subdetector Test Results: Results generated from dedicated ePIC subdetector
321 performance bench and beam tests should be labeled as "ePIC Beam Test" or "ePIC
322 Bench Test".
- 323 ● To ensure proper versioning, the results should be labeled with the month and year of
324 release in the format "mm/yyyy".

325 Published ePIC Results featured on the presentation slides and posters should include the full
326 citation of the paper, including the publication year.

327 **IV.2.2 Labeling of ePIC Technical Drawings**

328 All technical drawings presented outside the ePIC Collaboration that are related to ePIC Results
329 should be labeled with the convention "ePIC Technical Drawing" with the month and year of
330 release in the format "mm/yyyy" to ensure proper versioning, and archived similarly to ePIC
331 Results.

332 **IV.3 ePIC Results and Technical Drawing Archival**

333

334 Public ePIC Results and technical drawings presented outside the ePIC Collaboration must be
335 stored in a centralized location with appropriate metadata. It is the responsibility of the related
336 working group conveners or detector subsystem leaders to ensure this posting is done. Until the
337 establishment of the ePIC Collaboration document management system, the corresponding ePIC
338 group Wiki Page shall serve as the designated location for storage.

339

340 At a minimum, a high-resolution PDF of the plot or drawing must be stored. Additionally, other file
341 formats such as PNG or JPEG may also be included.

342

343 The metadata associated with each Public ePIC Result or technical drawing should include:

- 344 ● Name of the individual or group responsible for producing the result with contact
345 information.
- 346 ● The date when the result was produced.
- 347 ● A brief but descriptive description of the result, including, if applicable (but not limited to):
 - 348 ○ Information about the source of the data used in generating the result, including
349 details about simulation campaigns, experimental conditions, etc.
 - 350 ○ Relevant parameters used in ePIC (sub)detector simulations, such as detector
351 geometry, reconstruction thresholds, data sample/particle types, etc.
 - 352 ○ Details about the experimental setup for beam or bench tests, including equipment
353 specifications, configurations, calibration procedures, etc.

354
355

- References or links to any relevant documentation or methodology used in producing the result.