<u>DUNE Collaboration, Ed Blucher, Stefan Soldner-Rembold</u>

- Do you recognize the issue in your collaboration?

Yes

- Does your collaboration consider it an important/urgent topic?

Yes

- Do you already have a forum to discuss this?

We have discussed some of these issues with our Spokespersons Advisory Committee. Young DUNE representatives on that committee will raise these issues with Young DUNE members.

- Can you provide feedback on "best practices" that you already have implemented?

• What does your collaboration think about the conclusions of the ECFA report?

There has been no broad discussion of the report on DUNE

• Were some important issues perhaps not addressed?

See above

• Which system do you use for authorlists (alphabetical, opt-in, opt-out, other)? Is it generally appreciated?

Alphabetized author list widely accepted in particle physics experiments. All papers making use of data or collaboration tools include the full collaboration.

• 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?

• What do you think of making analysis notes (limited authorlist 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?

It should be noted that the option for small authorship technical publications exists in DUNE.

However, making analysis note is highly problematic and leads to many issues, just a few listed here: 1) Analysis Notes are not peer-reviewed; 2) Standards and requirements for Analysis Notes vary widely from collaboration; 3) Who defines criteria for selecting authors on such a note and ensures that authorship is assigned fairly? 4) Such notes can be used to make un-approved results public that create additional noise and confusion, e.g. if the measured value of a parameter differs from the published version.

• 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).
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?

The possibility of having collaboration prizes/awards is currently under discussion in the Spokespersons Advisory Committee and in the Young DUNE organization.

• 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 unblinded before graduation or end of contract. Is this an issue? If so, is there a mechanism to deal with that?

We have not yet had to deal with this issue.

• Do you have specific policies or practices to promote the work of juniors?

The Young DUNE organization is supported by DUNE management and is represented

We assume this question refers to the recognition of technical achievements. We have no specific policies in place for this. We recognize them through the usual methods such as convenerships, letters of recommendation, conference talks.

• 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 assess what a convenership entails ?

This will largely be done through letters of recommendation

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

- An elected Advisory Committee advised the Spokespeople.
- Regular collaboration wide ZOOM meetings where relevant topics are discussed.