

Perhaps we can further structure our feedback along the following categories:

- Awards and Rewards
- Reviews and publication procedures
- Authorship of papers and notes: recognizing contributions
- Conference presentations: selection and contents
- Decision making processes
- Promoting juniors
- Promoting technical work (Detector, Software, Calibration,...)
- Communication/information to committees inside/outside own research field
- ...

Some (controversial?) thoughts:

- Publications:
 - It makes no sense to publish with 1000s of authors. In fact: a bit ridiculous.
 - Is there really no way to reduce authorlists:
 - Eg.: Make use of “opt-ins” for projects and publish with projects?
- Reviews and publication procedures:
 - Journal peer review procedure de facto replaced by collab review procedure.
 - Collab review really very long. Are we becoming over-afraid to be caught on a mistake?
- Conference presentations:
 - Freedom for individual view very limited due to “on behalf of”.
 - Why not introduce a more individual talk type in addition?
- General: why are big collabs afraid/protective/conservative?
 - Funding? , Reputation? , Scoops?
 - Rethink public ownership, open access,