Challenges for our current leadership structure

1. It is often unclear which tasks belong where. The titles are not very descriptive, and even though we have now established processes for recurring tasks, I think we still do not have as clear a division of responsibilities as we could.
2. The "webmaster" role does not make sense. It has become centered around a person (me) rather than tasks fitting in that role. This makes the structure opaque and effectively makes me irreplicable in that role.
3. The code master role is clearly overburdened, and to some degree also suffers from irreplaceability.
4. Our deputy structure does not work as intended. We thought it could be a nice way to "train" collaborators to take the main role, as well as being a good CV bolster. The first has not happened, and for the second – what does "deputy to the code master" even mean on a CV?

We have now had some years to figure out the tasks needing to be solved after Torbjörn stepped down, so I think we are ready for the structure to evolve. Here is my proposal.

Proposed changes

We retire the "webmaster" role and the deputy system. Instead, we split the current code master into two separate roles and make a "task owner pool" system for distributing responsibility from the leadership to other collaborators in a more well-defined way. The three new roles would be **spokesperson, technical lead** and **release manager**, explained below. With this division, and the task owner pool, I think we could also consider introducing fixed term limits for all role, instead of just the spokesperson, as is the de facto status now.

The spokesperson (2.0) has focus areas: scientific steward, communication, outreach to users, conferences and experiments (i.e. following up with experimental liaisons) and internal meetings. They will absorb the documentation/webpage oversight and has the responsibility of making sure that all contacts through the issue desk is answered.

The technical lead has focus areas: code reviews, code architecture, long-term planning of contributions including internal contributor coordination. The technical lead is the person responsible for the long-term fitness of the code, and for making strategy for new directions, interfaces etc., to be agreed upon by the collaboration.

The release manager has focus areas: releases, code tests, including CI systems, approving merge requests with validation from the technical lead, to follow the release roadmap. The release manager is the person responsible for executing the strategy laid down by the technical lead.

The task owner pool is just as important. Instead of "deputizing" for a role, the three people above can delegate tasks from their area of responsibility to other collaborators for a fixed period, e.g. 1, 3, or 6 months. This will, I think, make it easier for new people in the

collaboration to take on an area of responsibility and make an impact. “Task owner of DevOps (2025)” also looks better on the CV than “deputy to the webmaster”.

We should also consider introducing “convenorships” as a more formalized contact person for various physics aspects. Peter: To be a bit more specific, I propose that the spokes be the backstop for issue-desk handling, but that we have “convenors” for big areas. At the very least I think we should have a heavy-ion convenor and a perturbative-precision convenor, whom the spokesperson can basically automatically delegate to on such issues, and it is then that person’s responsibility to delegate further or handle it themselves