



Some feedback from ATLAS

Flavia De Almeida Dias (Nikhef), Manuella G. Vincter (Carleton University)

Please see attached document for feedback on best practices. Some points from ATLAS:

- must **improve transparency of appointment process** (e.g. group convenerships, analysis contacts)
- has **hybrid selection/volunteering conference talk allocation system**
 - list of selected and volunteer candidates merged&sorted according to a ranking based on their contributions to ATLAS
 - allows more freedom to choose while still recognising contributions (i.e. talk allocation remains a recognition tool).
- considers **alphabetical author lists to be a great strength** of, and asset to our community and projects.
 - See document on outcome of a reflection group on limited authorship MC-based technical papers
- recognises that the **analysis-approval workflow as well as the crafting of publications can be a long and sometimes painful process** which can extend publication beyond a student's or postdoc's engagement in ATLAS.
 - analysis/publication process is currently under review, looking to skip steps that provide little benefit
- currently **not in favour of making either internal analysis notes nor statistics based on such notes public**
 - focusing on analysis notes appears to prioritise physics-analysis work over the many other important developments within a collaboration that are required to make an experiment work
 - Could create a two-tiered system within a collaboration & lead to loss of hardware, software/operations skills/experts
 - Challenge of recognition/statistics gathering of physics-analysis results (where documentation/information usually exists and is easy to harvest) over technical contributions to the experiment (where the metric is less straightforward).
 - easiest to collect stats on final elements of long collaborative chain rather than the earlier but equally critical elements
 - Externally applying standards without understanding individual cultures, constraints, other mitigation strategies already in place within the collaboration to recognise the contribution of individuals could be harmful to the collaborative process