

# September 26, 2022

Agenda: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1201119/>

Minute-taker: Steven

Chair: Valentina

Meeting starts at 14:04, together with the start of recording

## **Working group update: instrumentation - Younes Otarid**

- Working group focusing on Networking in Instrumentation
- Focus on bringing together a successful career in instrumentation, instrumentation training, tech-oriented discussions, etc
- Learned from pandemic that networking has become more tricky, want to create space of new kind for experience sharing + networking
- Launching a kickoff event on October 26, fully virtual via Zoom
- Event has been confirmed, with three invited panlists
- One from Uni Hamburg, one who has moved to instrumentation in industry, and one from CERN
- Idea of event: two chairs leading discussion, asking questions, creating dynamic exchange, lasting about an hour
- Then another 30 min extra for Q&A, also using breakout rooms in zoom chaired by a person from ECR panel for example (Armin+Sarah offered to take care of some, others welcome)
- These 30 min not mandatory for panelists, they can join but not required
- This kickoff event will not be technical, rather topic of building a career in instrumentation
- Date is confirmed with panelists, event communication is being finalised
- Anyone interested in participating or contributing to organisation, please contact Younes!

## **Introduction and OC news - Sarah Williams**

- Today is potentially last meeting of 2022, need to decide whether we need an October follow-up meeting or not
- There are some things to discuss, in particular panel membership for 2023, where many of us are reaching the end of our mandate
- Also the preparation of an end-of-year report
- Reminder of mandate, generally 2 years extendable for another 2 years
- Endorsed twice per year, in July (for July 1) and November (for January 1)
- Welcome to the new panel members, and thank you very much to the outgoing panel members!
- This year will be a large transition, as many of us are finishing our mandates
  - Survey earlier this year of how to proceed regarding extending mandates: 55% supported extension by one year, 25% for two years
  - Special case as a large amount of the first year was about defining the panel structure, so want two years to work on panel topics

- Proposing to extend anyone who wants by 1 year, and those who do not want an extension will be replaced as usual
- Form circulated on Friday to indicate information on availability or lack thereof to continue on the panel, and also to track changes of institutes
- End-of-year panel transitions
  - Both for the panel itself, but also for the organisation committee
  - For example, who organises the meeting in January 2023 - current OC or already define the new one?
- Working groups
  - Handful of working groups ongoing in the panel
  - Different levels of activity or intensity
  - All in a very self-organised manner, but that means sometimes it's hard for organisation committee to know who to contact when needing to discuss with the working group
  - Proposal to have contact(s) for the working groups, if we think this will make it more efficient, to be decided by the panel
- Getting feedback from panel
  - Several topics for discussion
  - Want to discuss it now to gather feedback and build possible options
  - However, not everyone can join us today - want full panel input as possible
  - Intend to thus circulate a poll in the coming days to gather panel feedback on each option that is proposed today
- Suzanne: Regarding working groups, as new member, trying to figure out which groups exist and what they do
  - Valentina: Collection of egroups where several meetings announced, but would be good to collect a list of egroups to share with new panel members
  - Sarah: good idea, particularly for those that operate through a mailing list that you sign up to at the start, should get that re-sent. Perhaps OC should prepare a draft of a kind of welcome document.
  - Valentina: agree, OC can take this action after the meeting, together with other actions from this meeting
- Steven: extending mandates by one year this once, this can help with staggering the panel transitions, as we have right now many people all aligned
  - Valentina: yes, think it's good practice to do so
  - Sarah: Also think we should find a way to document or otherwise let people know that people can step down when they need to during their mandate, not only after 2 years. Already seen a drift of people moving on, maybe explicitly should clarify that those who cannot stay on panel should let us know.
- Analuisa: What would be the subject of the meeting of October?
  - Valentina: Not mandatory to have one in October, there is an optional one in case of emergency follow-ups. We may or may not need one this year, depending on what comes up in the discussion today

- ECFA newsletter went out last week, had very positive response from RECFA on our contribution
  - Told us to let them know if we get any responses to our piece
- Mandates, please fill out the survey to understand who will continue in the panel for next term, and also to track changes of institutes
  - Generally good to also check with your country's RECFA delegate to let them know if you change country
  - Also remember you can always ask your RECFA delegate to be switched out early, with new mandates starting every half year, for starts January 1 or July 1
  - We need to let RECFA know soon who is staying vs going, so fill out the form soon
- New task force coming out of the R&D roadmap
  - R&D roadmap explicitly stresses importance of training and maintaining workforce for instrumentation in particle physics
  - This panel could include one or two representatives of the ECFA ECR panel
  - Not clear if it will be one or two people, but think we should decide among the panel of who will be our representative
  - Steven: when do we know if it's one or two people, and when does the decision have to be made?
  - Lydia: likely one, following up with Karl, and need to have for endorsement in November PECFA
  - Sarah: concern is that this is coming when we are having a big changeover of our panel, want to make sure such opportunities are also available for new panel members. Possibly we could elect one now who is continuing mandate, and reserve one slot for the new panel members? Also would be good to know how much work and what extra meetings need to attend, etc.
  - Lydia: No clear information on this yet, probably only decided when the panel is in place. Think it's a good opportunity for our panel to have someone there, as if we are being trained then we should be there to have someone guide what we learn.
  - Lydia: suggestion of one now and possibly one with the new panel, can bring this up with Karl, as long as we have one person before the November meeting.
  - Valentina: Organisation committee will take care of soliciting nominations from those who work in accelerator physics and prepare a poll
- Career prospects survey: sent to all RECFA members, being distributed among their countries
- UK initiative to promote ECR discussions in future colliders, very popular idea for RECFA for us to be more involved here

**Working group update: career prospects and diversity in physics - Armin Ilg**

- Two working groups until now, but given that the two groups have dedicated their efforts to a single common deliverable, considering them together for now
- Goal of survey is to understand what ECRs think about their career opportunities, physics programme, work/life balance, etc

- Circulated to ECFA ECR panel before summer, implemented your feedback, thanks to all involved
- The distribution is now underway by ECFA national contacts
- Also designed a separate survey for the ECFA national contacts, who are anyway distributing the survey, to compare the results of the ECR survey with the national contacts → identify where there are differences in perceptions
- First responses are arriving from both ECRs and national contacts, example of difference of views (with very low and initial statistics) for one question
- Next steps, circulation just started, planned until October 11 but likely prolonged by a week
- In a week or so, we will circulate among the large experiments, used also as a reminder for the survey. Still need people from CMS, LHCb, ALICE and smaller experiments to circulate it to their experiment lists. If you are a member of one of these and can circulate it, please write to us
  - Valentina: I can send it to ALICE
- All ECFA ECR panel members should also fill out the survey, and please circulate it also to other groups you know of
- Two large tasks after the survey is closed: analyse the results, and write a report. Other people volunteering to help here are welcome!
- For more information, to get involved, or to get updates, join the [ecfa-ecr-career@cern.ch](mailto:ecfa-ecr-career@cern.ch) egroup
- Valentina: If we don't receive an email from our national representative, what do we do?
  - Armin: if haven't received an email in the next week or so, probably good to contact your national representative or let the survey organisers know and they can do so
  - Armin: Looked this morning, many replies from Greece, Slovenia, and UK so seems those three countries have circulated so far
- Eleonora: Experience from survey done in Italy, planning to circulate also to MSc students or similar?
  - Armin: target group is ECRs, and MSc students are part of that
  - Main focus likely PhD/post-doc but MSc students do have a box that they can indicate their career level
  - Eleonora: Some institutions in Italy did not understand this, suggest to make it very clear that MSc and PhD students are included in the list
- Lydia: This was shown in RECFA meeting, one of RECFA delegates said they would like to see a mailing list in their country that would reach all ECRs. UK has a mailing list for PhD students but not post-docs for example. Thus hard to send to all who are interested. If people have a way to setup such a mailing list in their country, would help.
  - Armin: Don't think that the panel can set this up, has to be done country-by-country, but would be good to address this for the future.

#### **End-of-year report discussion - Steven Schramm**

- We previously discussed that the panel should write end-of-year reports, especially this year, given the large panel member transition

- Detailed description of what we have done, and why, to help future panel members understand (not to bind them to our choices)
- Also updates on our activities and what we have done in 2021+2022
- A draft outline was created, which can be found [here](#), an outline of which is:
  - Executive summary
  - Panel structure
  - Working group updates
  - Community interactions and feedback
  - Future plans
  - Conclusion/summary
- Some sections have obvious responsibilities, but in general we want input from everyone
- Report should be beneficial, not just an obligation
  - Help new panel members to understand what exists and has been done
  - Advertise our contributions
  - For authors, it should be made public in a citable format
- Path forward is very tight to make this happen before the end of the year
  - Aggressive progress will be needed to converge on something the panel can endorse, and make public
  - Most of the work (a solid first draft) will have to be done by mid-November
- Information will be circulated on getting involved
  - Even if you cannot write part of the report, please submit your suggestions/ideas!

#### **UK initiatives to promote ECR discussions in future colliders - Sarah Williams**

- Sharing experiences that a group of us have had in the past months within the UK
- ECFA and CERN Council chairs are very eager for more such discussions to take place
- Initial forum took place in Birmingham on April 25, follow-up planned in Cambridge on November 4
- UK has three ECFA representatives, but these events have been done in a slightly different group of ECRs from around the UK
- These events are very collider-focused, while our panel emphasises a more general scope
- What is an ECR - very difficult to provide a clear and common definition, and boundaries are often blurred
  - For meeting in December, PhD students or 10 years post-PhD
  - Nature of fellowship scheme in UK makes it hard to understand when the transition from ECR to permanent actually occurs
  - Also don't want to see strong division between ECRs and seniors, want everyone to work together
- Initial meeting on request by CERN Council leader when visiting UK, the local host asked ECRs to organise it as it was for ECR input
  - Same organising committee for first meeting and subsequent follow-up
- Most ECRs are not currently engaged in work on future colliders, so opportunity to inform the community and promote discussion, but means better to avoid technical details

- Overview and outcome of the meeting
  - Short talks, long discussion periods (with prepared questions if needed, but not needed in the end)
  - Avoid physics case for future colliders relying on current anomalies
  - Don't have a "no-lose" theorem for next collider, unlike LHC
  - Several comments and questions on staged options for FCC
  - Importance of smaller and lower budget experiments, not only FCC/similar
  - Discussion on accelerator and detector technologies, many of us didn't understand technological challenges associated with magnets for future hadron colliders
  - Lots of discussion on muon colliders, although technology is further away
  - Lots of concerns on energy budget and implications for climate change
  - Discussion on how to facilitate a future collider, and to learn about how to plan a future experiment
  - Significance of LEP tunnel when planning LHC, realistic budget envelope, etc
  - Importance of convincing scientific community, outside of HEP, of importance of what we are doing and possible synergies
  - Discussions on lack of ECRs involved in R&D, linked to both funding and barriers to career progression, and how these can be balanced
- Follow-up points
  - Many appreciated format of meeting, with lots of time for discussions
  - Further representation of theory and accelerator communities would be beneficial
  - Due to constraints on timing/venue, had to be an invite-only and in-person meeting of ~45 people. Thus working on a follow-up event to open up more generally to the UK community. Invites were defined based on nominations from head of groups, but want to make sure next event is open to all.
- Want to ensure coordination with similar efforts in other countries, if they start to do so
  - May want to organise a central event for all ECRs in Europe, or sets of events for ECRs in different areas
  - Also need to make sure we spread the load across different people, not having small number of people handling large amount of work, as this does take a lot of time
- Analuisa: Are there are minutes/etc from the meeting?
  - Sarah: for the first meeting we wrote an internal report that was used to apply for funding to the second meeting. However, no formal minutes, as wanted people to speak openly about topics.
  - Sarah: Next meeting is more in our control, and will likely have more formal minutes and write a report that may become public.
  - Sarah: Agenda for initial meeting is public, and slides from that are a good starting point
- Lydia: Do we want to organise this as the ECR panel all together and host it in different countries (to spread the load), or do we want to say each country should figure out if/how they want to host something like this?

- Sarah: If you want to do an initial meeting to inform and start discussions, that would be much better to be done centrally, as can use CERN and have all the videoconferencing support. Could have small breakouts for individual countries within that meeting.
- Sarah: in ECFA ECR panel, large variety of backgrounds not only collider, and so some areas may have none or only one representative in colliders
- Lydia: first event central makes sense, but indeed funding schemes very different in each country, so maybe could split those topics
- Sarah: Using a centralised event to facilitate more specific discussions within countries could be effective, could result in a report that highlights differences across Europe, which would be very interesting

Meeting ends, with no points raised as “any other business”