

IPPOG chair candidacy

18th IPPOG Meeting
CERN 28-30 November, 2019

Nicolas Arnaud (narnaud@lal.in2p3.fr)

Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire (CNRS / UPSud)

European Gravitational Observatory (CNRS & INFN)



Questions

- Would you be willing to consider the cancellation of the Saturday as a meeting day?
 - As an IPPOG member I try to adjust my schedule to match the IPPOG meeting dates and I prefer when there is a poll suggesting at least 2-3 different slots, pending organisational and other constraints.
 - As IPPOG chair, I would definitely involve the group more into the (re)definition of our semi-annual meetings: both their structure and their contents. Including a Saturday in our meetings ‘saves’ worktime but has drawbacks – family, break, etc. Seeing people leaving one after the other on the final Saturday morning while we are having our CB meeting is clearly bad: this must be addressed asap. Thus, I would circulate a poll asking for suggestions to see what people prefer, why they do so and see what the majority thinks. The new proposal would then be circulated widely before being endorsed by the CB.
- For that matter and others, I would seek more participation from IPPOG as a whole.

Questions

- What is your position towards associated members and how can they be involved and be effective in the activities of IPPOG?
[National Labs whose countries are members, who would like a non-voting seat at the CB.]
 - All associate members are more than welcome, provided that there is an agreement at the level of the country and that we keep one seat per country in the CB.
 - The MoU member and the associate members of the same country should agree on common positions prior to IPPOG / CB meetings.
 - Outside of the CB, there is no much difference between members and associates. All can be involved in any existing activity, suggest new ones, request support, report about achievements, etc. The procedures in place are the same.
- This should only provide constructive interferences, an asset for all members and the collaboration as a whole.

Questions

- What are your ideas to improve and make the agenda of the general meetings more effective? Currently there are some repetitions and probably more time should be allocated to more structured projects/events
 - First – as explained in response to the first question – a poll asking feedback from the collaboration as a whole to see what people like / don't like / would keep / would change / would improve.
 - Reporting about successful projects, ongoing activities, plans, ideas, etc. is an important component of our meetings as this is the place where we get new ideas, share experience, learn a lot. Yet, as the collaboration grows, as the fields extend, we have to limit this part: otherwise it could easily fill the whole meeting. Moreover, situations between countries are so different that it is often difficult to import in one's country what has worked elsewhere. We should ensure that the talks selected for in-person meetings reflect the diversity of the collaboration, both in terms of people and topics. Reports that cannot be included in a meeting agenda should appear in newsletters / news items released regularly in between meetings. Or we could have summary talks reporting about all similar activities at once.



Questions

- What are your ideas to improve and make the agenda of the general meetings more effective? Currently there are some repetitions and probably more time should be allocated to more structured projects/events
 - One way or the other, IPPOG should reach out external audiences with ‘deliverables’ ‘made in IPPOG’ – like any collaboration. These should progress in between meetings but meetings are the natural place to boost them with dedicated in-person sessions where people would meet, discuss concretely, make some actions and define together the next steps.
- I don’t know exactly yet how that could work given the number of countries, languages, fields we are representing in IPPOG, but I’m sure this is a way forward worth exploring all together.

Statement

Having been nominated by some of you and in agreement with my home and funding institutions (CNRS/IN2P3 and the European Gravitation Observatory), I am candidating for the 2019-2021 IPPOG co-chair position.

How many changes since I joined a group named EPPOG almost 10 years ago! IPPOG is now a formal, CERN-hosted, collaboration whose resources give it autonomy and capacity to act concretely to promote outreach for HEP and related fields. Although the IPPOG composition has evolved (and significantly grown) over the years, its spirit has remained the same, making IPPOG a truly unique place to do global and joint outreach. Therefore, being elected as IPPOG co-chair would first mean for me to acknowledge the achievements of the group, led by successive pairs of co-chairs. My initial goal would therefore be to match up to what has been accomplished so far and to help IPPOG progress even further.

Being a collaboration has many advantages but these come with duties and challenges as well. A key one – at least in France and probably in other countries as well – is to convince IPPOG funding bodies of the positive return on their investment. The new website and resource database will be essential to achieve this goal but, once the ongoing technical developments are over, it will be up to us to promote these tools and bring them alive. And what could help more for that than to reinforce the “IPPOG trademark”, by producing regularly contents for the community? Activity reports, synthesis on a given topic for education or outreach, inventories of existing resources, etc. And contents as multilingual as possible obviously.

Having a rock-solid budget will also be mandatory. With this goal in mind, I would suggest to extend the mandate of the IFAAB so that this committee would be directly involved in the preparation of new budgets.

Along with the existing working groups, I would look for ways to support the development of IPPOG-related activities in between the bi-annual, in-person, meetings – although I do know this would be challenging given that we are all very busy with various commitments outside IPPOG. In addition, I would make information flow more smoothly through the collaboration, possibly by reviving a light – but regular – internal newsletter. It should include reports from working groups and committees, a summary of ongoing actions, a list of recent IPPOG-related talks, etc. In particular, any official talk given on behalf of IPPOG would be circulated within the collaboration in advance, and reviewed before being presented anywhere.

The IPPOG target audiences have been well-defined over the years. I would certainly not change them. Instead, I would try to balance a bit better our actions towards people who do not necessarily have an easy access to science. That would be the continuation of many of the outreach/education projects I have led or contributed to in France for the past 15 years.

Working alongside other groups pursuing goals similar to ours is important. Therefore, I would spend some time stimulating the connections between IPPOG and EPPCN, with the

Statement

aim to have joint sessions again, either every other meeting like in the past, or remotely if synchronizing meeting agendas appears to be too complicated.

We are living complex times:

- a world with always more science and technology, but a broad mistrust of the general audience towards science;
- daunting questions regarding the future and the sustainability of our society and a levelling of opinions that may all ‘be the same’;
- more modestly, the need for many basic science areas – and HEP in particular – to design, promote, reach a consensus on, build and operate expensive projects on ultra-long timescales, whose success requires worldwide collaborations.

Yet, we have no choice but to face these challenges and I am convinced that IPPOG can help tackling some of them.

- By explaining again and again why scientific research – like art – is unique to humankind;
- By explaining discoveries and steps forward; by contextualizing decisions or questions;
- that, although profit is not the driving force of basic science, basic science often leads to societal applications that may have a great impact;
- by educating today’s students who will be tomorrow’s citizens;
- by promoting a wide set of science-related careers, etc.

Being IPPOG co-chair would be an honor and a significant responsibility. I would do my best, with the same commitment than for all the projects I undertake. And with a combination of management and hands-on activities, as I cannot conceive the former without the latter.

Last but not least and as obvious as this might be, I would always act as IPPOG co-chair for the advantage of the collaboration as a whole, keeping fully separated my functions of co-chair and the interests of France in IPPOG.

IPPOG chairs

- Having co-chairs is essential
- If I were elected, I would push for a single, non-renewable mandate of 4 years (3 is an odd number, 2 may be too short: an election every year), with 1/2 chairs renewed every two years to ensure continuity.
 - The IPPOG collaboration is large enough to be a breeding ground for chairs: a regular turnaround would protect against time's erosion
- In consultation with the IPPOG co-chair, I would have no problem being the person initiating that rota.

IPPOG personpower and budget use

- The need to have dedicated people working for IPPOG at 0.5 FTE or more
 - So not the chairs...
is essential
- CERN (Collaboration manager and Masterclasses) and USA (Masterclasses) are already contributing significantly to this effort
- Going beyond requires using part of our budget
 - After the current transition phase, we should have an open call to recruit someone who would match best the profile defined by the collaboration to fulfill well-defined tasks.

CV

- 45 years old
- **Research**
 - PhD staff researcher at Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire (LAL, CNRS/IN2P3 and Université Paris-Sud) in Orsay (France) since October 2003
 - Currently seconded to the European Gravitational Observatory (EGO), the host lab of the [Virgo experiment](#) (direct detection of gravitational waves)
 - Past
 - The Virgo experiment (PhD thesis)
 - The LHCb experiment (CERN fellow)
 - The [BaBar experiment](#) at SLAC
 - The [LUMI collaboration at DAΦNE](#) (Frascati)
 - The [SuperB project](#)
 - The Virgo experiment
 - Over the years, I have led various groups/projects: data taking coordination, sub-detector operation and R&D, online and offline data quality, home institution team.
- **Outreach**
 - **Outside IPPOG**
 - In charge of outreach and education in the IN2P3 communication team since 2012
 - Exhibitions: [cosmic rays](#), [accelerators](#), [CERN 50th anniversary](#)
 - Referring physicist at LAL for communication and outreach since 2009
 - The [Sciences ACO museum](#) – [EPS historical site](#) since 2013
 - The [“Passeport pour les deux infinis” book](#) and associated [website](#)
 - The [“Elémentaire” magazine](#); the [“Quark Poker”](#)
 - The [poster “Composants élémentaires de la matière” and its various translations](#).
 - The [CPEP poster about Gravitation and its various translations](#)
 - Outreach in LIGO-Virgo: multilingual resources, EGO site visits
 - “Recruiter” of high-school teachers for outreach activities and education actions, among which IPPOG's and CERN's
 - [“Cosmos à l'Ecole”](#) steering committee member
 - Lead organizer of [CERN's French Teacher Programmes](#) since 2012
 - Co-organizer of the [2017 French HSSIP program at CERN](#)
 - Masterclass sessions from 2009 to 2016
 - Coordinator of [the French Masterclass sessions](#) since 2011
 - **Within IPPOG**
 - French representative since 2010
 - Co-organization of two meetings: Paris (2015) and Pisa/Virgo (2018)
 - Masterclass steering committee since 2013
 - Global cosmics group
 - IPPOG Finance Advisory and Auditing Board