

Formation of the Collaboration

“Radiation hard semiconductor devices for very high luminosity colliders”

Minutes of the meeting held at CERN on 25 February 2002

(recorded by M.Moll, until topic 6., and G.Casse starting from topic 7.)

The meeting took place at CERN (593-R-010) starting from 10:00. A telephone conferencing system was installed allowing collaborators not present at CERN to participate in the discussions.

Welcome

- C.Joram welcomes the participants on behalf of the meeting organizers (C.Joram, C.DaVia and M.Moll).
- The following discussions were lead by C.Joram. The transparencies and the distributed meeting agenda are available on the collaboration www-page.

1.) Establishment of the list of represented institutes (in persona / by proxy)

- Only institute representatives have the right to vote. Institutes not present can transfer their vote to a proxy. One person can be the proxy for more than one institute.
- List of collaborating institutes and their representative or proxy (a detailed list can be found on the proposal and the collaboration www-page):

1. University and INFN Bari	Proxy:	M.Bruzzi (Florence)
2. CNM Barcelona	M.Lozano	
3. NCSR Demokritos	G.Kordas	
4. University of Dortmund	O.Krasel	
5. CiS, Erfurt		not represented, industr.partner
6. University of Exeter	Proxy:	Chairman of CB
7. University and INFN Florence	M.Bruzzi	
8. CERN	M.Moll	
9. University of Glasgow	M.Rahman	
10. University of Halle		<i>not represented</i>
11. University of Hamburg	E.Fretwurst	
12. University of Hawaii	S.Parker	
13. University of Helsinki	K.Osterberg	
14. Helsinki Inst. of Physics	J.Härkönen	
15. University of Karlsruhe	E.Grigoriev	(also member ITEP, Moscow)
16. Acad. of Science, Kiev	P.G.Litovchenko	
17. University of Lancaster	Proxy:	G.Casse (Liverpool)
18. University of Liverpool	G.Casse	
19. Kings College London	Proxy:	M.Moll (CERN)
20. University of Louvain	Proxy:	E.Grigoriev (Karlsruhe)
21. University of Lund		<i>not represented</i>
22. JSI Ljubljana		<i>not represented</i>

23. University and INFN Milano	A.Andreazza	
24. University of Montreal	Proxy:	S.Pospisil (Prague)
25. ITEP, Moscow	E.Grigoriev	(also member Karlsruhe)
26. Kurchatov, Moscow		<i>not represented</i>
27. University of Oslo	Proxy:	B.S.Avset (Sintef)
28. Sintef, Oslo		B.S.Avset, industrial partner
29. University of Oulu		<i>not represented</i>
30. Dip. Fisica and INFN Padova	R.Riccardo	
31. University and INFN Perugia	Proxy:	M.Bruzzi (Florence)
32. Rutgers University	Proxy:	C.Joram (CERN)
33. University and INFN Pisa	A.Messineo	
34. CTU and Charles Uni Prague	S.Pospisil	
35. Acad. Science Prague	J.Popule	
36. Ioffe, St.Petersburg	Proxy:	E.Grigoriev (Karlsruhe)
37. University of Surrey	P.Sellin	
38. University of Syracuse	Proxy:	C.Joram (CERN)
39. University of Tel Aviv	A.Ruzin	
40. ITC-irst Trento	M.Boscardin	
41. INFN Trieste	S.Dittongo	
42. BNL, Upton	Proxy:	M.Bruzzi (Florence)
43. Brunel Uni, Uxbridge	C.DaVia	
44. IFIC-Valencia	S.Marti	
45. PSI, Villigen	T.Rohe	
46. University of Vilnius	J.V.Vaitkus	
47. ITME, Warsaw	E.Nossarzewska-Orlowska	

- 45 institutes and 2 industrial partners
- 5 institutes and 1 industrial partner not represented

1*) Info from CERN / LHCC

- Report on comments/ recommendations given by Mario Calvetti, chairman of the LHCC, in a discussion with the meeting organizers:
 - o LHCC has very positive attitude towards the proposal
 - o be careful not to include institutes, which are not contributing actively to the work
 - o Missing in proposal: What are you expecting from CERN and what would the collaborating institutes contributing? A more detailed work plan of the different sub-projects
 - o proposal will be discussed 14/15 March in a LHCC internal meeting
 - o 15/16 May – presentation of our proposal to the LHCC

2.) Late applications to join the collaboration

- Two request to join the collaboration are accepted:
 - o University of Perugia, Italy, Teamleader: Giorgio Umberto Pignatel
 - o Sintef, Oslo, Norway (industrial partner); Teamleader: Berit S. Avset
- The two institutes should be listed in an addendum to the proposal

3.) Discussion on status of industrial partners

We agreed on the following points:

- industrial partners are not represented in the collaboration board
- industrial partners do not pay a contribution to the common fund

- team members of industrial partners are listed as co-authors on common publications (same rules as applicable to all other collaboration members)
- two teams (Sintef and CiS) are treated as industrial partners

The teams of CNM (Barcelona), IRST-ipc (Trento) and ITME (Warsaw) are full collaboration members. However, due to their special situation (they have to finance themselves at least partly by commercial income) there might arrive conflicts with their commercial interests, e.g. when the collaboration is going to tender products which they are able to sell. In such cases the CB shall decide to not allow them to discuss/vote about these issues in the CB.

4.) Formation of the collaboration board (CB)

- The CB is consisting of 45 institutes (see topic 1. and 3.)
- 40 institutes are represented in this meeting (12 by proxies)
- 5 institutes are absent

5.) Decision on election procedures

- It is agreed that in this meeting the elections of the chairperson of the CB and his deputy, the budget holder and the contact person at CERN should be open elections
- The elections of the spokesperson and his deputy are secret elections (ballots).

6.) Election of the chairperson of the CB and a deputy

- One candidate for the CB chairperson: Eckhart Fretwurst (Hamburg University)
- Eckhart is elected by the CB
- Eckhart takes over the chair of the meeting

- Two candidates for the deputy of the CB chairperson:
 - o Gianluigi Casse (Liverpool University)
 - o Kenneth Osterberg (Helsinki University)
- Gianluigi elected; Gianluigi (26 votes); Kenneth (1 vote)
- Gianluigi assumes his position and records from now on the minutes

7.) Recommendation of the 4 wise men concerning the structure of the collaboration

The 4 wise men recommend:

- to set up the structure to be able to change after one year: therefore all the positions should be elected initially for 1 year.
- It would be good to have a North American and an European Colleague in the top level management.
- Co-spokespersonship of an American and an European colleague would be a way to implement it.

8.) Discussion of the organizational structure of the collaboration

- The meeting organizers propose to organize the research work into teams (3-5), which focus on specific activities (e.g. defect engineering, basic studies, new structures, new materials) with a convener for each team. The team relate to the co-spokespersons (two are recommended) or to the spokesperson and its deputy. Again it is stressed that the election should be for 1 year.
- The North America institutes propose a geographical division of the research work in three areas (North America, Europe...) each with the supervision of a co-spokesperson.

9.) Decision about the organizational structure

No other proposals are presented by the CB. The CB is asked to vote between the division of the research work in teams or in geographical areas. The first option (teams) is chosen by the large majority of the CB.

The second item discussed is the choice between the 2 co-spokespersons or a spokesperson + deputy. The chairman asks the CB to vote with the following results:

- 2 co-spokespersons: 11 votes
- spokesperson + deputy: 22 votes

The latter option is accepted by the CB

10.) Report of the 4 wise men about the search for spokesperson candidates

The 4 wise men have carried out a preliminary investigation within the community to identify candidates to the position. The candidates are:

- Marina Artuso (Syracuse University, USA)
- Mara Bruzzi (INFN/University of Firenze, Italy)
- Cinzia da Vià (Brunel University, London, UK)
- Claude Leroy (Montreal University, Canada)

The absent candidates should be able to communicate by telephone during the election. The spokesperson(s) should be elected for one year.

11.) Discussion and decision of election procedure for spokesperson(s)

The chairman asks the CB for more candidates. No further candidates are presented.

The agreed election procedure is the following:

- 2 separate elections for the spokesperson and its deputy
- every CB member (or proxy) has two votes, to distribute to one or two candidates
- election is carried out in two iterations: in the first iteration the two most voted candidates are selected for the second iteration. With the same procedure (two votes for each CB member/proxy) the candidate with the highest number of votes in the second iteration is the elected spokesperson

The procedure is repeated in full to choose the deputy spokesperson among the remaining candidates.

The points 12. (Presentation of spokesperson candidates) and 13. (Election of spokesperson) are postponed in order to allow North America candidates to phone the CB

14.) Election of contact person at CERN, in case no spokesperson is stationed permanently at CERN

The CB proceeds to the election of the CERN contact person, being clear that the spokesperson candidates are not stationed permanently at CERN.

M. Moll is nominated and appointed CERN contact person.

15.) Discussion and decision on common fund (CF).

Nomination + appointment of CF budget holder

- Common fund. Two proposals are presented to fund the collaboration:

1. Set up a low volume common fund via an agreed sum given by each institute (proposed sum: 2000 CHF/year) to be used for activities of common interest (collaboration workshops, rental costs ...). For specific project funding (the scientific activity within the teams, e.g. material acquisition, processing costs) additional contribution could be asked to participating institutes.

2. High initial contribution such to cover the costs of the scientific activity
In kind contributions for economically weak areas can be accepted by the CB.

The chairman asks the CB to vote. Option 1. is chosen by unanimity.

- Nomination of the budget holder

C. Joram is nominated and appointed for this task.

16.) Discussion and decision about publication guidelines and rules for representing the collaboration (conferences/workshops)

The CB discussed and approved the following guidelines for publication of the research work of the collaboration and their presentation to conference/workshops.

- Publications
- Regular status reports to LHCC: all members are authors. The CB representatives maintain the author list of their institute
- Publications in scientific journals. Reviews covering the research program of the whole collaboration: all members are authors
- Reviews or specialised articles describing the research work of one or more research lines: the convener(s) discuss(es) and decide(s), if required, on the author list.
- Internal RDxx notes: the convener(s) discuss(es) and decide(s), if required, on the author list.
- Conference/workshop presentations
 - Contributed talks: the speaker discusses the abstract with the convener(s). Written proceedings are treated like normal publications.
 - Invited talks: in the case the invitation is directed to the collaboration, the choice of the speaker is the responsibility of the spokesperson in agreement with the conveners. Written proceedings are treated like normal publications.

12.) Presentation of spokesperson candidates

The candidates have 10 minutes to introduce themselves, their experience relevant to the research subjects of the collaboration and their understanding about the role of the spokespersons within the collaboration.

- Marina Artuso presented herself by telephone, underlining her relevant scientific experience and her view about the tasks of the spokesperson. After the presentation the CB asked about how much time she could spend working for the collaboration compatibly with other duties and how often she could come to CERN. Marina guaranteed to give at least 50% of her time to the collaboration and to be able to come to CERN with perfectly adequate frequency.
- Mara Bruzzi was present and gave an overview of her previous relevant scientific activities and her view of the task required to the spokesperson. Asked about how much time she could dedicate to the collaboration she has guaranteed about 60/70% of her time with frequent visit to CERN. She has underlined to have the support of her institute and the INFN if appointed to the task.
- Cinzia Da Vià was present and introduced herself and her scientific activity on the relevant subjects. She gave her view on the aim of the collaboration and of the role of the spokesperson. When asked by the CB about the time she intended to dedicate to her spokesperson-ship and the availability to visit CERN she guaranteed about 70/80% of her time and very frequent visit on site.
- Claude Leroy couldn't be present or reachable by telephone due to previous commitments. M. Moll was asked to read an e-mail he sent to introduce himself to the CB, underlining his scientific experience in relevant topics, his view of the role of the

spokesperson and committing himself to dedicate significant time to the task and to visit frequently CERN.

Before voting a phone call from Z. Li (BNL) underlined again the opportunity of having a European and a North American person at the top level management of the collaboration. The chairman proposed a vote to decide whether the election of the deputy spokesperson should be limited to representative of the other geographical area than the spokesperson himself (e.g. the election of a European spokesperson which limits the choice of his deputy among the candidates from North America only) or whether the election should be left free to the voters. The results of the vote were:

- Geographical restriction on the choice of the deputy: 12 votes
- Free vote: 21 votes

13.1) Election of spokesperson

The election of the spokesperson was conducted with secret vote according to the agreed procedure.

1st iteration, 39 institutes out of 47 are voting directly or by proxies (6 institutes are absent and 2 industrial partners are not voting)

Candidate	Collected votes
M. Artuso	2
M. Bruzzi	26
C. Da Vià	25
C. Leroy	24

2nd iteration

M. Bruzzi and C. Da Vià go through for the second iteration. In this second iteration M. Artuso abstains so the voting institutes are 38.

Candidate	Collected votes
M. Bruzzi	42
C. Da Vià	34

Mara Bruzzi is elected spokesperson of the collaboration.

13.2) Election of deputy spokesperson

The election of the deputy spokesperson was conducted with secret vote according to the agreed procedure.

1st iteration, 39 institutes out of 47 are voting directly or by proxies (6 institutes are absent and 2 industrial partners are not voting)

Candidate	Collected votes
M. Artuso	4
C. Da Vià	30
C. Leroy	44

2nd iteration

C. Da Vià and C. Leroy go through for the second iteration. In this second iteration M. Artuso abstains so the voting institutes are 38.

Candidate	Collected votes
C. Da Vià	29
C. Leroy	47

Claude Leroy is elected deputy spokesperson of the collaboration.

The agenda of the Part I of the meeting has been fulfilled. Start the second part, chaired by the spokesperson M. Bruzzi

Part II.

1.) Discussion of the program of the submitted proposal

This item was skipped

2.) Discussion of possible topics for teams

A discussion about the scientific activities took place within the CB. Numerous ideas have been proposed to the attention of the community. The spokesperson will take the responsibility of contacting the representative of the member institute to identify the topics for the research teams.

3.) Discussion of the milestones

An indicative agenda of milestones to cover the three year activity of the RDxx collaboration has been proposed.

6.) Next meeting

A possible date for the next collaboration meeting could be September 2002. This date has been proposed taking into account the timescale for the discussion and (hopefully) approval of RDxx by CERN/LHCC.

Finally, it has been observed that no decision has been taken about the quorum (minimum number of institutes participating to a collaboration meeting) in order to validate the decision taken during the meeting.

It has been discussed about the procedure to follow in case of institutes that fail to contribute actively to the collaboration. It has been suggested that the spokesperson should contact that institute to enquire about the possibility or intention to provide a more active participation and, in the case this latter couldn't be achieved, asking the institute to resign from the collaboration. It is voted whether or not this statement should be noted in the Memorandum of Understanding: yes(22 votes); no (0 votes).