

# Minutes of the 1st meeting of the DRD7 Collaboration Board

22 October 2024

Indico link: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1469822/>

Attendees (thanks to I. Redondo):

<b>Institute</b>	<b>Attending representative</b>
Graz University of Technology, Institute of Electronics	Alicja Michalowska-Forsyth
CERN	Francois Vasey
Bergische Universitaet Wuppertal	Wolfgang Wagner
Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY)	Christian Reckleben
Forschungszentrum Jülich	Andre Zambanini
RWTH Aachen University, Physics Institute IB	Lutz Feld
Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech)	Andrii Chub
Centre for Energy, Environmental and Technological Research (CIEMAT)	Ignacio Redondo
Galician Institute of High Energy Physics (IGFAE)	Antonio Fernandez Pietro
Instituto Tecnológico de Aragón (ITAINNOVA)	Fernando Arteché
University of Barcelona-ICCUB	David Gascon
Laboratoire de Physique de Clermont - LPC	Louise D'Eramo
Laboratoire de physique nucléaire et de hautes énergies (LPNHE)	Giovanni Calderini
Université Aix-Marseille, CNRS-IN2P3, CPPM	Renaud Le Gac
INFN Pisa	Simone Cammarata
Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna Pisa	Claudio Oton
Università degli Studi di Milano and INFN Sezione di Milano	Laci Andricek
University of Bergamo / INFN Pavia / University of Pavia	Luigi Gaioni
University of Udine	Stefano Saggini
Daegu Gyeongbuk Institute of Science and Technology (DGIST)	Do-Won Kim
NIKHEF	Ruud Kluit
Norwegian Institutes (UiB, UiO, USN) represented by University of Bergen (UiB)	Joham Alme
Queen Mary University of London (QMUL)	Marcella Bona
UKRI-STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL)	Mark Prydderch
University College London (UCL)	Andreas Korn
University of Birmingham	Alan Watson

# Welcome and timelines for Collaboration setting up

(A. Andreazza)

## [Slides](#)

The list of collaborating institutes has been collected by the Steering Committee during the preparation of the proposal. There are 68 institutes (including the ARCADIA Collaboration) from 19 countries (including CERN).

The proposal contains 15 Projects (PRJ), included into 6 Work Packages (WP), and 1 Working Group (WG).

Now the Collaboration has started the process of setting up the operational bodies.

The Collaboration Board chair has been elected following the guidelines defined in the Proto-Collaboration Board Meeting of 26th June 2024 and now the process will be to define the management structure and elect the governance that will guide the collaboration in the writing of the MoU.

Some informal meetings, to which 24 institutes participated, were held in preparation of the 1st Collaboration Board.

The MoU writing procedure will start from the current General Conditions for CERN Experiment and the Template MoU distributed on 9th October. The process will consist in open discussions in the Collaboration Board meetings, followed by offline voting to allow a broad participation of the community.

Given the importance of the initial steps and the fact the MoU will have a legal status, it is proposed to have a quorum of 50% of participants for the validity of the voting, and decisions based on the relative majority of the votes, possibly with only binary options.

The topics discussed today, including the Governance Structure (but the Resource Board that will require some preparatory work), will be voted on after the meeting and the outcome will be included in the annexes that will be discussed and approved by the next Collaboration Board. That will allow proceeding with the election of the Governance. In this phase meetings of the CB will happen every 1-2 months and the new governance may be in place early in 2025.

Some actions will be started after the Collaboration Board:

- Build a small team to help writing the MoU parts (**volunteers are welcome**)
- Update information of institutes (matching with CERN database) and contact information of CB members (to address issues in assessing the indico pages)
- Create a CDS repository for DRD7 documents
- Make a survey to get suggestion about matters of common interests that needs some manpower:
  - Web site is being managed by the Strasbourg group
  - Testbeam and/or irradiation access
  - Maintaining publication lists

# News from the Steering Committee

(F. Vasey)

The Steering Committee has been taking care of driving all the DRD7 Collaboration activities for the preparation of the DRD7 Proposal and the initial steps of the MoU draft. Now most of the collaboration aspects are passed on the Collaboration Board.

The Steering Group met the Work Package Conveners after the DRD7 workshop, providing some guidance on the preparation of the Annexes for the MoU. A new meeting is foreseen to update the strategy according to the text of the latest MoU version..

The Steering Committee is also the DRD7 interface with the ECFA Detector Panel, which held the DRD Managers Forum. There were two meetings of the forum, one in July after the first template of the MoU was released, and one on 14th October, after the release of the 2nd version. The template MoU has gone through the legal service of CERN, and the core part has little freedom to be changed. There is a deadline to provide feedback by 9th November. A final iteration of the template will be issued at the end of November/beginning of December.

There are a few specific items where feedback of the Collaboration Board is welcome:

1. Nomenclature: the template MoU mentions WP, WG and "other working entities". Annexes are based on WP. The SC approach has been to consider PRJ as deliverables of the WP, in order to have a single annex per WP, and that requires some implementation in the MoU template. The same working structure can be obtained by renaming the current WP as WG and the PRJ to WP, with the need to provide formal detailed annexes for each Project.  
There is not change in the working model, but a final choice needs to be done quickly to provide guidance to the MoU writing.  
*Attilio reports that during the consultation with institutes, nobody raised issues about the WP/PRJ model presented by the steering group and there was no objection from the attendee to go forward with implementing original SC's proposal in the MoU*
2. In the new template MoU, personnel tables needed for the resource estimation make a split between "Physicists" and "Engineer+Technicians". The DRD7 proposal contains no distinction between physicists and engineers, it has one single column for FTEs. If we must increase the granularity in the annexes, we should either adhere to this convention, which reflects the internal organisation of some FA, or to differentiate between "Physicists+Research Engineers" and "Technical Engineers+Technicians", which is preferred by some other FA.. it would be useful to understand the most common situation within the DRD7.

There are two other requests of input from the Collaboration:

1. Among the DRDs a discussion is ongoing about the presentation of contributions to the update of the European Strategy on Particle Physics. In particular, should DRD7 vision be presented in a specific document or should rather be included in a general document by the ECFA Detector Panel?

2. With the frequency of one every few weeks, the SC receives the request to distribute to the general DRD7 mailing list announcement or job opportunities. Till now they have been rejected, but this is an important networking aspect of the Collaboration.

*A. Andreazza proposes to start a survey (not a vote) for the points on personnel tables, European Strategy contribution and usage of mailing lists. Institutes need to be addressed anyhow for an update of the Institute information.*

## Walkthrough on selected parts of the MoU

(A. Andreazza)

[Slides](#) and [Template MoU](#)

The MoU describes the agreement of the proponent Institutions, with the support of their Funding Agencies, to form the collaboration. The MoU is legally binding only for the articles concerning the intellectual properties (art.10), compliance with export regulations (art.11) and relationships with external partners (art.13), but recognizes that adherence to it by all parties is a key ingredient for the success of the Collaboration.

Institutions and funding agencies need to be explicitly listed in the Annex 1 and 2. Some information needs to be gathered to fill the annexes, in particular to understand which institutes will sign by themselves of which will be represented by a FA.. Contacts and e-groups need to be updated to have smooth voting procedures.

With respect to the original 67 institutions (excluding the ARCADIA Collaboration, which is actually represented by other institutes) there are already many others wishing to contribute officially as soon as possible. This topic has also been stressed by F. Vasey and L. D'Eramo.

Since we need to define the electorate for a number of the next steps, it is proposed to keep the list of 67 members till internal collaboration rules are defined. A possibility is to tight the acceptance of new institutes to the updates of WP Annexes. Since WP Annexes are to be ready for the circulation of the MoU signature new institutes will be able to participate in the very first official collaboration MoU.

Article 5 and annex 5.2 describes common collaboration equipment and rules for its management. DRD7 has no common collaboration equipment, but it is requested to keep the section for uniformity across the DRD7 and for flexibility in case of the development of really common infrastructures.

Article 6 defines as the main bodies of the Collaboration the Collaboration Board (CB) and the Resource Board. Details are then given in annexes 4.1 and 4.3. The composition of the Resource Board is unclear until it is defined which are the institutes represented by Funding Agencies, so its discussion is postponed.

With respect to the default version of the Annex 4.1, the CB will not be the Steering Committee, but this is a separate entity. On a question from G. Calderini, F. Vasey explains that the SC is conceived as a body of senior experts with a global vision of the field, providing advice and stimuli to the body of WP Conveners, typically more junior experts on their specific fields. During the informal contacts with institutes, there were no strong opinion on the formation of this body, but there were two major options:

1. The SC is elected by the CB, and it selects the Spokesperson among its members
2. The Spokesperson is elected by the CB, and it selects the members of the SC

Other hybrid options may be impractical.

In the following discussion F. Vasey explains the option 1 is more likely to receive candidatures by people with the desired profile, since they are usually quite overloaded and this option allows for a sharing of the load. A. Andreatza comments that option 1 emphasises the political nature of the SC, as an emanation of the CB, while option 2 stresses its scientific role in support of the Spokesperson.

These two options will be submitted to the Collaboration Board to provide guidelines for the content of annex 4.1

The proposed structure of the collaboration requires also some other modifications to the default text of Annex 4.1:

- WP Leaders will be replaced by WP Conveners, nominated by the SC
- An additional structure of Project (as WP deliverables) need to be introduced, with a Project Leader proposed by the community behind the project
- The Technical Committee and its functions need to be defined

The details in Annex 4.3 can be defined only after the results of the voting on the Spokesperson/SC formation procedure.

The CB terminates with the following actions on the CB chair:

1. Collects from the CB representative information about their institute and FA data
2. Perform a survey across the Institutions about the various topics raised in the news by the CB chair and the Spokesperson
3. Organise an online approval of the guidelines for the composition of the CB, admission of new institutes, election of Spokesperson/SC, endorsement of the WP/PRJ structure