Organization of the LHCHXSWG: Proposals

P. Savard on behalf of

of the Steering Committee

7th July, Preparatory Meeting of the LHCHXSWG

Introduction

- After the YR4 exercise, it is a good time to consider modifications to the working group's structure
- A questionnaire was sent out to get your feedback (as discussed in previous talk)
- In this meeting we are discussing future work and directions for the short term and longer term: the group structure should evolve to meet these new goals and milestones
  - By the end of the year we should already have more than twice the SM Higgs signal statistics that we had in Run 1 and we expect about 10 times the statistics by the end of Run 2. Even larger samples for potential BSM signals
  - A lot of interesting physics to extract from those datasets. The LHCHXSWG has a clear role in helping the experiments exploit the physics potential of Run 2. What is the best management, group, and subgroup structure that will allow us to fulfill our mission?

Present structure

Steering Committee Members Mail

ATLAS		CMS		THEORY		
Pierre Savard (Toronto)	Markus Schumacher (Freiburg)	Marco Pieri (UCSD)	Alexander Nikitenko (IC, London)	Daniel de Florian (Buenos Aires)	Christophe Grojean (Barcelona&Hamburg)	Fabio Maltoni (Louvain)

Working Group Conveners

- We are organized in 3 working groups.

Group TWiki	Mail to conveners	ATLAS	CMS	THEORY	
Higgs XS&BR	Mail	Bruce Mellado (Witwatersrand)	Pasquale Musella (Zurich)	Massimiliano Grazzini (Zürich)	Robert Harlander (Wuppertal)
Higgs Properties	Mail	Chris Hays (Oxford)	Mingshui Chen (CN)	Adam Falkowski (Orsay-LPT)	Gino Isidori (Zürich)
BSM Higgs	Mail	Nikolaos Rompotis (Washington)	Roger Wolf (KIT)	Ian Low (Argonne and Northwestern)	Margarete Mühlleitner (Karlsruhe)

- Remove **SPAMNOT** from mailing address when sending.

Sub-working Group / Task-force Group Conveners

Group TWiki	Group Mailing List	Mail to conveners	ATLAS	CMS	THEORY

13 sub-groups/Task-force groups + PDF + MCNet

Re-organization Proposal

TH (2-4)+ATLAS(2)+CMS(2) coordinators

SM subgroups:

ggF, BR, VBF/VH, ttH/tH, fiducial/template xs, offshell, EFT/PO, bbH/bH, HH

BSM subgroups:

MSSM neutral, MSSM charged, Extended scalars, nMSSM, Exotic decays

Re-organization Proposal

- Removes one management layer, essentially keeps subgroup structure (but can evolve based on needs and timing)
- Coordinators:
  - propagate the needs of the experiments to subgroups and make sure that the tasks are fulfilled in time
  - supervise work of subgroups together with subgroup conveners
  - responsible for the documentation together with subgroup conveners (LHCHXSWG Notes, YRs)
  - search and nominate the subgroup conveners
- Some advantages:
  - Lighter administrative structure, less bureaucratic
  - More direct involvement of coordinators in subgroup activities and decision process, more direct bottom-up communication, shorter feedback loop
  - No segregation of subgroups within groups*
- Some disadvantages:
  - Increased workload for coordinators. The group has gotten larger and we now have many subgroups: too many subgroups to follow to be effective?
  - too fragmented activities and no direct incentive to communicate between the different subgroups*

Status Quo Proposal

(Current LHCHXSWG organization)

- **Keep current structure (with perhaps some adjustments, clarification/ modification of the WG convener role, different mode of operation for subgroups*)**

- **Some advantages:**
  - **Work done for YR4 very much appreciated by the experiments: if it ain't broke, don't fix it (too much) but perhaps tweak structure, perhaps re-define roles of WG conveners and steering committee**
  - **potential to create a dynamic among different subgroups inside a common WGi -> easier to deal with common issues (mentioned this morning)**
  - **simplified organizational structure for general meetings and YR preparation**
  - **Activities more closely followed**

- **Some disadvantages:**
  - **Current administrative structure is rather heavy, too(?) hierarchical**
  - **Feedback from many is that the current structure is not efficient in terms of communication and decision making (lack of transparency, slow feedback loop)**

- **Note: Clearly, decisions made when no consensus is reached can lead to some tensions, and questions about how decisions are made. Re-organization will not eliminate situations when we fail to reach a consensus…**