



Report to the collaboration

G. Kramberger (JSI) M. Moll (CERN) I.M. Gregor (DESY) S. Seidel (UNM)



DRD3 collaboration



143 institutions / 700++ people in the community e-group



Main events since the last DRD3 week:

- Lots of scientific meeting across many WGs
- Preparation of WP projects is underway
- ➢ MoU is in the final stages of preparation
- We have the endorsed the rules of collaboration which will enable us to move to collaborative work
- > New institutes wanting to join us.
- Things are really starting to evolve....

DRD3 – structure of the collaboration DRD3





MoU – July-November developments DRD3

- MoU template (<u>https://cds.cern.ch/record/2914779?ln=en</u>) has been written by CERN (first version received in June) and several meetings were held with CERN managements and DRDs to converged on common MoU (distributed to DRDs in October).
- The MoU is very general in its core and confirms the validity of the collaboration structure
 - WGs as long term organizational entity
 - WPs tool to address short to mid-term strategic goals
- CERN would like to keep the "core MoU" almost identical across the DRDs. It is a wish by CERN that so called "core MoU" would be signed by most of the institutions
 - It defines the general rules and structure of the collaborations (also Intellectual property)
 - In case of DRD3 already has financial implications of 2000 CHF/year for CCF (sum is not defined in the core).
- The real content is in the Annexes important ones:
 - Annex 1 and Annex 2 participating institutions and their funding agencies (CB representatives are urged again to fill in the tables if not done already). Each institution can be represented by more than one FA (e.g itself + national FA).
 - Annex 4 collaboration structure and our collaboration internal rules
 - Annex 7 WP part (next slide)
 - Annex 8 WG description
 - Annex 9 Common Collaboration projects now part of the MoU annexes new with respect to RD50

Status of the DRD3



7.2

7.2.1

Annex 7 : WP – strategic funding

Funding Agency

Annex 7 Work Packages

.1	Structure of the Work Packages
	(1) Work Package 1: (title)
	(a) Deliverable 1.1: (title)
	(b) Deliverable 1.2: (title)
	(c)
	(2) Work Package 2
	(a) Deliverable 1.1: (title)
	(b) Deliverable 1.2: (title)
	(c)

7.2.3 Funding Agencies

Country

_ DRD3

As mentioned before, this could include funding agencies that are not signatories of the MoU.

7.2.4 Start And End Date, Deliverables and Time Scale

The Work Package starts on start date and ends on end date.

Representative

Funding

Agency

Code

The deliverables, time scales and contributing institutions are indicated in the table below.

Institution(s)

represented^b

Description

The purpose of this Work Package is to build and test a prototype of XYZ. The Work Package carries the number WPi.

7.2.2 Participating Institutions

Work Package 1: (title)

Country	Collaborating Institution	Town	Institution Code	Contact

Number	Title	Description	Start date	End date	Institutions
Di.1					
Di.2					
Di.3					

NOTE: WPs can be signed by FAs that are not signatory of the MoU!

03/12/2024

Status of the DRD3



Annex 7 : WP – strategic funding



FA B via Helge Meinhard Institution 4 As said in the main body, this could include Funding Contributions of Participating Institutions and Funding Agencies to the Work 7.2.5 Agencies that are not signatories of the MoU. Package Total FA B The estimations in the table below are the person-power (FTE, or full time equivalent) and costs for designing, constructing and testing XXX for the lifetime of the Work Package. Total Major Deliverable Funding Total Helge Meinhard Agencies Dil Di2 Di3 In the DRD Managers' Forum meeting on 14 October 2024, it was proposed to replace "Physicsts" by "Scientists" without reaching clear consensus. This Contributions from other sources ngineers and technicians FTE months Physicists: FTE months Physicists: FTE months Physicists: FTE months Physicists: FTE month point still needs to be resolved. igineers and technicia FTE months Engineers and icians: FTE mont ngineers and technicia FTE months Material / kCHF Material / kCHF Material / kCHF Material / kCHF DEF via Institution / Institution 5 Funding Helge Meinhard echnicians: Codes from Annex 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 Agency GHI via Institution 6 Major (e.g. national) Funding Agencies Total other FA A via sources Institution 1 FA A via Total (Major Institution 2 Funding Total FA A Agencies plus other sources) FA B via Institution 3

7.2.6 Management Structure of the Work Package

The management structure of the Work Package is described in Annex 4.1.

7.2.7 Persons Currently Holding Functions of Specific Responsibility in the Work Package

Function	Name
Work Package Leader	
Work Package Deputy Leader	

Resource board (MoU) – composed of all institutions/FA, not necessary CB representatives, which decides on financial matters. One of the possibilities is for CB to act as RB with exception for WP projects. **Resource coordinators – acting as a person for interaction with FAs?**



MoU – DRD3 perspective



- Such Annex 7 structure needs a better granularity in the form of WP projects
 - Definition of the WP project leaders some FA will not commit unless it is in MoU that people they gave money to are responsible
 - Reduction of deliverables may lead to some of the institutions not being listed to taking part in the deliverables list.
 - Adding new WP project requires less complicated procedure than modification of all existing tables in a given WP, but also means that WP projects need to be properly shaped so that we don't have duplication of projects dealing with the same topic!
- WP project structure and collection of them on the other hand can lead to very large MoU example of DRD1
- Deliverables and tables in Annex 7 will be updated regularly
 - need the vote and approval of the FA representatives for each WP project but not a resigning of the MoU!
 - we can also extend already approved WP project tables
- CERN wanted at least some WP projects to be reviewed by us and approved by CB and RB (includes FA representatives) before signing the MoU!
 - > The system is incompatible with grant awarding schemes of some FA (Spain, USA,...)
 - Groups don't want to put forward project proposal with their FA listed without previous consent of their FA (catch 22 problem)

https://cds.cern.ch/record/2914779?ln=en





Possible solutions:

- CERN may accept the initial signature of MoU without explicit obligations (financial and labour) listed in Annex7.
- The same is also true for Annex 8 where participating institutions need to estimate the FTE involvement in the WGs.
- The signatory of Annex 1 (members of DRD3) can be also institutes acting as their own funding agency (tables allow contributions from other sources).



Although institutes would benefit by signing the MoU (access to CERN facilities as DRD3 members, advantages at project calls...) it is unlikely that all the groups will sign the MoU. This should not prevent the groups from being a DRD3 member: contribution to CCF and commitment to adhere the collaboration rules are the conditions for the membership.



- All institutes act as its own FAs and have resources to deliver the project the origin or resources is on them (industrial projects, already approved national/EU projects, special agreements with FA).
- The difference between CCF and WP is the level od commitment and objectives of the project (WP – Annex7, CCF – Annex9)



Why do we need another review if we already respond to FAs that provide the funds?

- access to infrastructure in the collaboration
- increase the visibility of the work
- widen the collaboration and exchange of knowledge
- use of CCF
- do good for the community



• Inst. 1 – acts as its own FA and has resources to fulfil the project

• Inst. 2,3 and Inst. 4,5 are asking their FA for resources to take part in the project

- Projects should be done in such a way that rejection from one FA doesn't collapse the whole proposal
- The fact that rejection from one FA may endanger the whole structure may be used as leverage in talking to FAs

Overview of WP projects discussed DRD3

WP2

- > 3D silicon sensors as timing detectors (University Freiburg; R2.1,R2.2)
- > Development of very small pitch, ultrarad-hard 3D sensors for tracking + timing applications(FBK; R2.1, R2.2)
- > Novel silicon 3D-trench pixel detectors based on 8-inch CMOS process (IME; R2.2)
- Development of Ultra Fast-Time Low Mass Tracking Detectors (FNAL/BNL; R2.3)
- > 4DRSD: 4D-tracking with Resistive Silicon Sensors (INFN-TO; R2.3)
- > TI-LGADs (UZH; R2.3)
- > LGAD based timing tracker development for future electron collider (IHEP; RG2.4, RG 2.3)
- > ASIC Development for Timing Measurements using LGAD Sensors for CMS Tracker phase III (PSI)
- > Advancing the Pixelated Resistive Silicon Readout and Charge Collection Techniques
- > Characterizing the Environmental Operational Envelope of Timing and Resistive Silicon Sensors
- > NEUROPIX: A neuromorphic computing framework for pixelated detector data processing (ORNL)
- > OPTIMA, a board dedicated to Optimized Precision Timing for Multichannel Acquisition (USC) a. Contact: Federico de Benedetti
- LGAD and 3D technology at the IMB-CNM (CNM)

> It is clear that we need shaping of the projects:

- Some are important, but don't directly pursue the research goals of the scientific proposal (ideal for CCF projects, intra DRD projects)
- There is duplication of certain activities (e.g. AC-LGADs, 3D ...). We need to join/shape WP project proposal and subdivide it in activities; different processing, but joint characterization, testing, simulations... looking for synergies. This will enable more coherent work, better integration of different sites.
- It is evident that proposals are in different stages of preparation -> we should focus on those that are close to ready and move forward – we can always add more later

m WG2~research~goals~<2027		
	Description	
RG 2.1	Reduction of pixel cell size for 3D sensors	
RG 2.2	3D sensors for timing ($\leq 55 \times 55 \ \mu m, < 50 \ ps$)	
RG 2.3	LGAD for 4D tracking $< 10 \ \mu m$, $< 30 \ ps$, wafer 6" and 8"	
RG 2.4	LGAD for ToF (Large area, $< 30 \ \mu m, < 30 \ ps$)	



Overview of WP projects discussed



WP1

- Fine-pitch CMOS pixel sensors with precision timing for vertex detectors at future Lepton-Collider experiments (DESY/CERN)
- > TPSCo 65nm CMOS with high precision timing (IP2I; FCC-ee, RG1.1,1.5)
- CMOS Strip Chip for Future Tracking Detectors (IHEP)
- Development of MAPS using 55nm HVCMOS process for future tracking detectors (IHEP)
- >HV-CMOS Multi-chip integration for large area silicon trackers (INFN-MI, also WP4)
- > Cactus: Large electrode designs for timing with and without intrinsic amplification (IRFU)
- > Thin monolithic High Voltage CMOS sensors with excellent radiation tolerance (L'pool)
- Radiation hard read-out architectures (CERN)
- >MAPS developments at SLAC (SLAC)
- CASSIA CMOS Active SenSor with Internal Amplification (CERN)

+ more on Thursday/Friday

- We need the decision on shaping of the projects according to e.g: > Technology
- Design (small/large electrode)
- Performance goals (ee machines, hh machines,...)
- Segmentation type (strip/pixel/active)
- Novel approaches (gain CMOS)

m WG1 research goals <2027		
	Description	
RG 1.1	Spatial resolution: $\leq 3 \ \mu m$ position resolution	
RG 1.2	Timing resolution: towards 20 ps timing precision	
RG 1.3	Readout architectures: towards 100 MHz/cm ² , 1 GHz/cm ² with 3D stacked monolithic sensors, and on-chip reconfigurability	
RG 1.4	Radiation tolerance: towards $10^{16} n_{eq}/cm^2$ NIEL and 500 MRad	
RG 1.5	Low-cost large-area CMOS sensors	



Status of the DRD3



Overview of WP projects discussed DRD3



- Radiation hardness of 25um 3D diamond detectors (Manchester)
- SiC LGAD Detector (IHEP)
- > Development of radiation-hard GaN devices for MIP detection (Carleton)
- Towards a Radiation Damage Model for 4H-SiC with SiC Schottky Diodes/Material and radiation hardness studies of planar SiC diodes (ÖAW)
- Radiation damage in Si PiN and LGAD sensors (NIMP)

WP4 (WG7):

- Development of in-house plating, hybridization and module integration technologies for pixel detectors (CERN, Fondazione Bruno Kessler, LPNHE Paris, Univ. Geneva, 7.1 / 7.2 / 7.3)
- > Ultrathin hybrid pixel detectors using wafer-to-wafer bonding (U. Bonn, IZM)
- 2 Project proposals at the interface with DRD7 for which groups had expressed interest (ongoing) RG 7.2 / 7.5.
 - Improving classical bump-bonding process
 - Module 2.5D integration

m WG3 research goals <2027		
	Description	
RG 3.1	Start of building up data sets on radiation-induced defect	
	formation in WBG materials	
RG 3.2	Continue developing silicon radiation damage models based	
	on measured point and cluster defects	
DC 22	Provide measurements and detector radiation damage mod-	
nG 3.3	els for radiation levels faced in HL-LHC operation	
RG 3.4	Expand the measurements and models of silicon and	
	WBG sensors properties in the fluence range 10^{16} to	
	$1 \cdot 10^{18} \mathrm{n_{eq}/cm^2}$	

m WG6 research goals <2027		
	Description	
RG 6.1	Development of small cell 3D diamond detectors (cages $/$	
	interconnects, base length 25 μ m) and possible exploitation	
	of impact ionization	
DCC	Fabrication of large area SiC and GaN detectors, improve	
ng 0.2	material quality and reduce defect levels.	
RG 6.3	Improve tracking and timing capabilities of WBG materials	
RG 6.4	Apply graphene and/or other 2D materials in radiation de-	
	tectors, understand signal formation.	

inter DRD CDS already discussed new this time





- The collaboration has endorsed the provisional collaboration agreement.
- The agreement is needed to ensure that procedures are agreed and should steer the collaboration until the MoU is ready and signed.
 - accepting new members
 - election and endorsement procedures
 - rules to fund CCF projects
 - rules of spending RD50 CCF
- The DRD3 collaboration by-laws (Annex 4.3 of the MoU) will be only slightly modified by the exact procedures on approval of the projects.
 WP project proposal – DRD management review – CB approval – RB approval (FA representatives included)



Scientific activities in the last months DRD3

Note: only those listed in the indico – many more in smaller circles!

- WG1 3 meetings (mostly WP project proposals)
- WG2 3 meetings (WP project proposals and recent scientific results)
- WG3 1 meeting (organizational)
- WG4 7 meetings (scientific and WP project proposal related)
- WG5 2 meetings
- WG6 7 meetings (scientific and WP project proposal related)
- WG7 1 meeting (organizational)
- WG8 associated to other e.g. DRD3 TCT-School presentation

Most of the meetings are half day events – so the scientific activities are on-going

WGs 4,5 are very active (TB organization, TCT school, Lots of simulation and DAQ developments) WG8 has started to ramp up the activities – promotion of the school, logo...

https://indico.cern.ch/category/17387/





We are still not in the state to start submitting the collaboration review papers, but we were invited to some (all DRD3 related talks should be in CDS: >CEPC workshop (WG1/WP1, WG2/WG2, Outlook for DRD3) >Pixel 2024 – WG6/WP3 presentation Alex

DRD3 is organizing TCT school (4-6.3.2024 at CERN):

- Duration 2.5 days
 - · Half day plenary with introductory talks
 - 3x half day hands-on parallel sessions (SPA-TCT, TPA-TCT, Signal formation & simulation)
 - Conclusion half day analysis session
- Up to 18 participants + demonstrators (lab space constraints)

DRD3 web page:

job announcements!, conferences of interest, meetings, school, contactswe should fill it with outreach material



Conclusions



- We are progressing well with few bumps on the road ...
- Scientific meetings are regular and number of proposals is growing.
- We need to converge with finalization of the WP projects
 - Please upload the proposals to the CDS
 - Indicate where you would need help
 - Communicate with WP leaders and try to shape the WP projects into MoU ready form.
- We don't need to have all WP projects ready soon, but we need some ...
- We will collect CCF contributions in 2025 and CCF projects can start (the ones including the DRD3 money)

Many thanks and let's get to work....

(no AI generated and HI-edited image for closing slide - not a decent scientific talk)