

S. Paul and A. Bressan, for the COMPASS Collaboration

About 200-230 members, with 40-50 PhD students, form the COMPASS Experiment. Order of 10-15 PhD students graduate every year. As Experiment, we discussed many times the way to recognize the work of the younger and help them in their future career. We now see many of our former colleagues working with responsibilities at CERN, in the US (as the case for the EIC project), at FAIR and in other institutes around the world. Even if we think that we may improve further, and that sometimes we failed in the recognition of individual contributions, we are proud of these results. Hereafter the answers to the specific questions.

1. *What does your collaboration think about the conclusions of the ECFA report?*
 - a. No feedback yet
2. *Were some important issues perhaps not addressed?*
 - a. -
3. *Which system do you use for authorlists (alphabetical, opt-in, opt-out, other)? Is it generally appreciated?*
 - a. Alphabetically, with the possibility to add as corresponding authors distinguished colleagues that lead the analysis.
4. *Which system do you use for assigning conference talks? How are talks prepared within the collaboration? Do people feel there is enough freedom to determine the contents of their talk?*
 - a. In most of the cases (i.e. if available) the first presenter of a new result is the PhD student who has performed the main part of the analysis. Otherwise, talks are assigned based on the requests and propositions to the Publication Committee. Students are given priority in the choice.
 - b. By the rules, talks have to be sent to the Publication Committee at least 1 week before the conference and the content is approved by this body, after eventually requiring modifications. A rehearsal is most of the time organized by the same body to help sharpening messages.
 - c. Presenters decide the content of their talks and aside veto on material not approved for public release the Publication Committee has never cancelled a presentation based on the content. Nevertheless, since the presentation is made "on behalf of the Collaboration" we require a coherent message on future steps and proposal for new measurements.
 - d. Typically, (young) presenters give test presentations in front of the analysis groups. For presentations on specific technologies, this is the task of the respective subgroup.
 - e. Owing to the large fraction of young scientists within COMPASS, PhD students and young postdocs typically present results at more than one workshop/conference per year. Details rather depend on the travel budget of the respective group.
5. *What do you think of making analysis notes (limited author list of analysis proponents) public? What are reasons pro and con to do that? Would you object to a system where statistics can be*

collected for the proponents of such ana-notes? Would it be useful to introduce a JENAS wide system?

- a. We do require “release notes” for discussing releases and these are signed only by members participating to the analysis. Nonetheless we don’t expect them to be public for two reasons.
 - i. They will need to be reviewed in all the aspects, while presently it contains only confidential material
 - ii. All results are joint collaboration results and not only in the hands of members which carried the final analysis. We are a small collaboration and within any single result there is the work and dedication of almost any single member in the chain from proposal-hardware setup-data collection-data processing-simulation, analysis and discussion of the result within the full analysis group
6. *What is your opinion of prizes and awards? Do you differentiate between awards (a prize for “the best”) and “rewards” (a prize for “an achievement” – no selection).*
 - a. We don’t have prizes and awards within the collaboration. The number of students obtaining their PhD per year is small and will be difficult to keep an overall balance over years. However, this has been addressed recently and had been welcomed by the institute board.
7. *One way to recognize achievement is appointing people to responsible positions (board member, conveners, reviewer etc.). How does that work in practice in your collaboration? Does it have a political aspect e.g. equal share between countries?*
 - a. The only board which is governed by share between countries is the Collaboration Board, which is the deciding body of the collaboration. In this case the members are appointed by the groups belonging to specific Countries and account for the overall number of paying members from the Country. All other bodies (including Spokespersons) are either elected or appointed by the Collaboration Board based on merits. However, we do appoint young scientists (postdoctoral level) to leadership positions on analysis groups and run coordinatorship.
8. *Analysis reviews are sometimes lengthy procedures that take longer than the job contract of individuals doing the analysis, such that papers are not ready to be published or that results are unblinded before graduation or end of contract. Is this an issue? If so, is there a mechanism to deal with that?*
 - a. We do have specific rules for authorship and exceptions. Whenever a student is no longer part of the Collaboration but has made relevant contributions (directly or indirectly) to an analysis, a request for an exception is made to the Collaboration Board, discussed and typically approved by it.
9. *Do you have specific policies or practices to promote the work of juniors?*
 - a. Many. A designated junior member is part of the search committee for Spokespersonship candidates. Juniors are first in the list for talks. We try to push distinguished juniors as conveners of workshops or conferences, parallel sections. We encourage juniors to take responsibilities within the collaboration
10. *Do you have something in place for recognition for technical issues?*
 - a. Not as a collaboration, but our groups many times give the responsibility of detectors to distinguished juniors. Technical papers are signed only by subgroups and the technical

contributions are underlined there. We discuss technical (detectors/DAQ) aspects at our yearly conference and ask for relevant presentations (if any) to the international committee in charge of the program.

11. What do you put in place to help the recognition of individuals by members external of the collaboration (for instance for their career advancement). Is there a way for external referee to asses what a convenorship entails?

- a. Spokespersons or other relevant figure issue supporting letters, when requested, in which the relevant contributions are underlined. Since we are a small community these are under the eyes of everybody in the experiment, especially to representatives. Responsibilities, participation to drafting committees, participation to analysis or R&D are all well documented and can be accessed in case of needs.

12. Are specific measures in place to include individual's opinion in decision making processes?

- a. Aside for the Collaboration Board, all our meetings are open and everybody is entitled to express his opinion. All opinions are weighted by the body in the decision making process. On the contrary, the Collaboration Board has ex-officio members that would bring the opinion of different bodies (Analysis Group, Technical Board etc.), or if needed can request the participation of external to gain information when needed.