



LABORATÓRIO DE INSTRUMENTAÇÃO
E FÍSICA EXPERIMENTAL DE PARTÍCULAS
partículas e tecnologia

[Feedback from ECFA]



P. Conde Muíño with input from
K. Jacobs, N. Pastrone,

Feedback received

From ECFA Collaborations

- Worries about the possible measures taken in case of unbalance
- Questioning ECFA authority
 - Particularly collaborations strong participation from countries outside Europe
- Questioning ECFA authority
- The survey may not provide unbiased data
 - Even important surveys for the life of the collaboration may get 10% of answers
- Big collaborations already have a Diversity and Inclusion group
 - Not worried about providing us with their information
 - May be useful to work in collaboration with them
- Big collaborations can provide unbiased data from their DB
 - They miss age, career level and citizenship
 - May be able to distinguish some categories (i.e. student, engineer, physicist)
- Some diversity groups also think that we should take more actions, that there are sufficient statistics demonstrating imbalance in Europe.

Answers so far

From collaborations?

- CALICE
 - Interested but worried on data privacy and possible measures if survey demonstrates unbalance
- NA61/SHINE: agreed
- LHCb: forwarded mail to their Diversity Group
 - No feedback so far
- ATLAS
 - Positive feedback
- Didn't push further with other collaborations to clarify first the data privacy issues

How to Move forward?

- Profit from the big collaborations diversity office
 - Contact them, try to get the data in collaboration with them
- Survey versus collaborations DB?
 - Both?
 - Survey: larger amount of variables (more useful!)
 - Collecting partial data from the collaboration useful to test possible biases
- What about ECFA authority? How to convince collaborations to participate?
 - Provide arguments?
 - Diversity important for all of them
 - Clarify possible measures taken? → we would need to decide on these!

Data protection

Issues

Feedback

From CERN data protection office

- Need to ensure we cannot distinguish single people answering the survey
 - Need to regroup categories such that this is always possible
- Mandatory even if the survey is voluntary
- Requires a study of the expected population
- Since the survey is configurable we could choose different grouping for different categories

Grouping Collaborations

- Size:
 - Big collaborations (> 2000 members)
 - Medium size (>500 and < 2000 members)
 - Small size (>100 and <500)
 - Very small (< 100)
- Field of research:
 - APPEC (Astroparticle Physics)
 - ECFA (Accelerators or collider physics)
 - NuPECC (Nuclear Physics)

Could think of separating CMS and ATLAS (but then should be more careful with the countries)

Would join DUNE (>1000) LHCb (~900)

Grouping Countries

- Big countries can be separated

- CERN
- Germany
- France
- Italy
- UK
- USA
- Canada

- Group smaller countries

- Northern Europe (Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, ...)
- Central Europe (Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, ...)
- Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, ...)
- Southern Europe: Spain, Portugal, Greece, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, ...
- Central+South America + Africa
- Other Asian Countries + Australia, New Zealand, ... ?

Is this granularity fine in other domains?

—> Should confirm with APPEC/NuPECC

- Russia
- China

This is fine with CMS and ATLAS

What about DUNE+LHCb?

Spain+Portugal have enough stats together, but the other countries might not have enough stats in some collaboration groups (such as LHCb+DUNE)