

EPS-AG Board Meeting

Thursday 2nd November 2023

Meeting documentation:

<https://indico.stfc.ac.uk/event/925/>

Access key: EPSAGNov23

Attendees

Peter	McIntosh	STFC	PAM	Chair
Adriana	Rossi	CERN	AR	Revisor
Ezio	Todesco	CERN	ET	
Rogelio	Tomas	CERN	RT	
Nicolas	Delerue	CNRS	ND	Treasurer
Marie-Helene	Moscatello	CEA	MHM	
Victor	Malka	Weizmann	VM	
Alessandro	Fabris	ELETTRA	AF	
Mamad	Eshraqi	ESS	ME	
Enrica	Chiadroni	La Sapienza	EC	
Ralf	Gebel	FZJ & GSI	RG	
Jordi	Marcos	CELLS	JM	
Atoosa	Meseck	HZB	AM	
Eduard	Prat	PSI	EP	
John	Thomason	STFC	JT	Revisor
Adriana	Wawrzyniak	Solaris	AW	

Apologies

Ivan	Andrian	Elettra	IA	Jacow Indico Lead
Ralph	Assmann	GSI	RA	Ex Officio
Hanna	Franberg	Ganil	HFD	IPAC26 LOC Chair
Gianluca	Geloni	EuXFEL	GG	

EPS-AG Finance Update – Nicolas Delerue (IJCLab)

- Summary prepared by I Ubaldo (previous treasurer), awaiting revised finance status from EPS secretary, expected by end Oct - Investment account balance indicated at €125k and General account balance at €66k.
- IPAC account balance at €49k, which included additional sponsorship from labs who had previously requested refunds from contributions made for IPAC2020, all other labs had agreed to keep funds in place to support IPAC23. There is expected to be a small surplus which would be available for future IPAC conferences.
- General account expenditure of €30k, which includes €25k contribution for the SPMS to Indico development as agreed by the IPAC-Collaboration Committee (IPAC-CC), €5k which had been transferred to the Jacow account primarily to keep the account active. The Jacow account is currently closed in terms any expected future expenditure.
- Noted that the IPAC24 sponsorship solicitation is imminent.
- JT queried whether the Jacow account (or others for that matter) would incur penalties if its balance reached a minimal level, ND indicated that this wasn't expected to be the case.

IPAC23 Lessons Learned – Alessandro Fabris (Elettra)

- Participation from 37 countries, 1660 participants, 98 grant funded students, 121 industry registrants – the largest attended IPAC conference in its history!
- ~100 registrations in last week, week exceeded certain aspects of conference delivery i.e. banquet and conference bag numbers.
- Noted also that 57 participants had indicated that they were EPS reduced registration free attendees, however some had not maintained their EPS accreditation, which required some further follow-up from the LOC team.
- Noted that there was only 15% industry participation from outside EU.
- 2270 abstracts, with 19% withdrawn which is typical for IPAC conferences.
- Expect to have a positive financial balance, however accounts are still being ratified.
- It wasn't clear how any such surplus should be either declared or otherwise utilised based upon limited Jacow guidance, which cannot provide a legal base for the management of this issue.
- AM indicated that any such legal implications are difficult to conduct without strict provision being set prior to the event organisation, which may require EPS to have some direct involvement, which could encompass sponsorship of the future conference as a necessary provision. PAM agreed to investigate with both Jacow and previous IPAC chairs to identify how best to utilise budget surplus for future IPAC EU conferences. **PAM**
- The poster session had assumed ~350 posters/day, however the figure rose to ~510/day owing to the increased number of abstracts, requiring a re-organisation of venue layout making some areas more constrained.
- Difficulty experienced with issuing of poster ID codes, owing to the early deadline set for the LPR process, which presented problems with the poster board layout closer to the time of the conference.
- ND queried the impact of the LPR on poster assignment codes, which appears to be as a result of reconciling those posters which have been withdrawn, which only becomes visible nearer the conference date and so conflicts the original assignment made for the LPR contributions.
- AR queried how best to improve the process whereby a lead author who has a number of posters is able to ensure that proximity of posters can be appropriately maintained. It wasn't so clear how best this could be done, depending on the categories of representation, however this is what the Jacow team have to establish in the most optimum manner.
- The compact nature of the venue in Lido was very well appreciated.
- The student tutorial session had 138 students participating, which was identified as being mandatory for all grant funded students.
- With no registration requirements, other students turned up which generated some concerns regarding the space being provisioned, which whilst turned out to be ok, should be more carefully addressed in future.
- The EO session proved significantly positive with a larger participation than expected, which was the first time this session was included for a EU IPAC conference.
- Industry participants were queried whether an expected provision would be more beneficial, by extending into the Thursday, as dismantling booths during the conference on Wednesday was felt to be quite disruptive.
- It was also suggested that the provision of an EPS-AG booth would have been beneficial for promoting the impact of our organisation.

- Large number of satellite meeting requests received, requiring an additional room to be made available, even with the specific and strict provisions identified for the time during the conference that such meetings could take place.
- A limited level of remote streaming was made available, which included primarily the opening, prize and closing sessions, with ~350 participants connecting intermittently. It was therefore not so clear whether this provision should be made available in future.
- There were 1213 installations of the conference App, however it wasn't so effectively used to query specific talks during the scientific programme.
- All organisation documents are available on the Jacow document store, however some key information was missing, resulting in decisions being made dynamically as conference arrangements evolved:

<https://www.jacow.org/Editors/RunningJACoWConference>

- ME proposed that this documentation should be more proactively disseminated, not just to EU organisers, but also to other regions. PAM agreed to investigate how Jacow organisation info is best disseminated. **PAM**
- For the accelerator prizes, as awarded by EPS-AG, it wasn't indicated where the medals are to be sourced from. It required investigation to identify that some blank medals were available, however they needed to be sourced, which have been forwarded to the IPAC26 LOC team.
- There were also some unwritten rules, such as that the IPAC Scientific Secretariat should also take responsibility for the EPS-AG meetings, which wasn't made known to the LOC team at the outset.
- There was also an expectation that the IPAC conference should provide PRAB sponsorship funds, which isn't specifically identified in the conference delivery mandate. As no specific instruction is provided, there is no legal base to support the fulfilment of such obligation by the organising team. Under such circumstances, INFN administration cannot transfer funds to PRAB.

IPAC23 Light Peer Review Review – Nicolas Delerue

- This was the first conference that used Indico for LPR provision.
- Submission deadlines brought forward to facilitate, which provisioned the process 6 wks before the conference.
- The Indico system however had not been developed to fully include the LPR capability, which required a substantial amount of additional code to be written (by ND himself) to resolve organisational issues, these codes have been subsequently transferred to the Jacow team for future utilisation as appropriate.
- PAM queried whether Indico had been developed any more extensively to ensure the LPR module was more established, to which ND didn't think had been conducted to date as yet.
- 100 LPR submissions made in the last 48 hours, contributing to 292 LPR papers being processed, 2 of which were rejected, 1 of which being off topic (HEP detector), 3 were also withdrawn, equating to 93% acceptance rate, for what was an intensive 6 wk period.
- IOP formatting guidelines were not so straightforward, requiring a submission by Oct 23 and formal publishing in Jan 24, which is assumed to be able to maximise PRAB Journal Impact Factor accreditation and indexing.
- The effect on impact factor for PRAB not yet clear as IPAC conference proceeding indexing has not yet been performed effectively, expectation that IPAC22 will be more visible this year.

- The papers which were proposed by reviewers for direct PRAB publication were not so effectively accepted, thereby questioning whether this recommendation mechanism should continue in future.
- 605 reviews undertaken, equating to 2 reviews/paper, 18% of which were from China as the highest contribution, with relatively evenly balance across MCs, except for MC3 which was substantially lower.
- Some papers were misclassified, requiring improvement in the indico process to address requested changes as part of the SPC2 evaluation, which doesn't appear to have closed-out the requests substantiated.
- ME noted that a number of papers were requested by the SPC to be re-classified during the SPC2 meeting, it isn't clear however whether this was done in indico, thereby generating further complications for the LPR process potentially.
- It was noted that the reviewer provision to opt-in as default provision should in fact require reviewers to opt-out, as responsiveness from some reviewers was not very effective.
- The timescale provisioned for reviewer response of 10-days was probably too excessive and so a 7-day deadline would have been more appropriate.
- It was noted that a number of students had requested LPR as principal support for their Phd thesis.
- Recommend that LPR coordinators are involved in previous conference SPB processes.

IPAC26 Preparations – Hanna Franberg-Delahaye (Unavailable)

- PAM agreed to contact HFD to obtain the IPAC26 material to be presented and distribute for review and comment. **PAM**

Indico Implementation and Status – Ivan Andrian (by video)

- The SPMS structure was identified, which generates the conference instances, linking to the user profile repository and utilising regional support centres at FNAL, CERN and KEK.
- Indico has a number of modules, which both replicate and strengthen the IPC conferencing management processes.
- The Conference Assembly Tool (CAT) in indico replaces the SPMP scripting tools and is used to generate the abstract booklet, check pdf compliance for papers and generates the conference proceedings.
- CAT provide a more accurate translation of pdf papers to be read on smaller screens, such as phones and tablets and is managed by the Jacow organisation team.
- It is available on Github and is opensource, was funded by EPS-AG, APS and NSRRC, however its complete migration is not yet finished, further work required, and completion timescales are uncertain, with the main repository needing to be replaced.
- ME suggested that the same Github location being used for Jacow, should also house the new LPR tools, which ND would investigate. **ND**

EPS Bylaws Change Implication – Peter McIntosh

- PAM summarised the meeting that took place on 20/10 with Luc Berge (EPS President) and Anne Pawsey (EPS General Secretary), with RT and RA also taking part.
- The proposed EPS bylaws change (Rule 21.4), stipulates, *'All prizes and distinctions awarded by EPS Divisions, Groups and Committees must be endorsed by the Executive Committee, and will include the inclusiveness requirements adopted by the Executive Committee'*.

- EPS-AG concern being that this additional endorsement procedure could compromise the timescales for issuing prize notifications.
- EPS expect any endorsement to be principally regarding the IPAC prize management process, not the judging decision itself, requesting the IPAC prize panel to provide a short report summarising the process employed, for which EPS would provide their usual template.
- EPS agreed that they could provide their feedback within 1-wk, which could be formally guaranteed.
- EPS also indicated that providing they are aware of the typical process being used, there is likely no need to interrogate anything in addition during the week of the conference for the Bruno Touschek and Student Poster prize nominations.
- Our consensus was that the bylaws change could be accommodated within existing IPAC prize management processes – RA to chair for IPAC26.
- ND indicated that an action document provided by EPS is needed to ensure their agreed commitments are maintained, such as the 1-wk response time, which PAM agreed to propose to the EPS. **PAM**

IPAC29 LOI Hosting in Europe and Timescales – Peter McIntosh

- PAM presented the timescales for the solicitation of proposals (May/Jun24) and the EPS-AG site hosting decision at IPAC26 OC1 meeting in Dec23, with the IPAC20 site selection instructions posted in indico for feedback. **All**
- RT, ND and AF all noted that the timescales to prepare the final proposal was challenging and so suggested that an earlier solicitation process be launched in Mar/Apr24.

Task Force Discussion – Communications – Peter McIntosh

- Opportunities to improve EPS-AG visibility and impact using its website, social media and newsletter/bulletins were discussed, with PAM identifying that the existing EPS-AG website requires some urgent updates, as information is either incorrect or otherwise duplicated.
- The consensus being that whatever is proposed should not duplicate what might already be available in different forums, with any associated administrative effort being clearly identified.
- PAM agreed to start updating the existing EPS-AG website with correct information and removing the duplicate site as indicated. **PAM**
- EPS-AG were also encouraged to explore and identify further communication opportunities which might be suitable to investigate. **All**

Task Force Discussion – Topical Workshops – Peter McIntosh

- Owing to lack of time at the end of the meeting, PAM requested EPS-AG to assess what a topical workshop provision could look like i.e. topics, connections to other groups, structure and management, funding etc, for more extensive discussion at the next EPS-AG meeting. **All**

Next EPS-AG Meeting

- It was agreed to have the next EPS-AG Board Meeting in February, to allow us to finalise the IPAC29 site hosting solicitation documentation and timescales, which PAM would coordinate offline. **PAM**

Peter McIntosh 23/11/24

Action Summary:

#	Action	Who
1	To investigate with both Jacow and previous IPAC chairs to identify how best to utilise budget surplus for future IPAC EU conferences.	PAM
2	To investigate how Jacow organisation info is best disseminated.	PAM
3	Contact HFD to obtain the IPAC26 material to be presented and distribute for review and comment.	PAM/ALL
4	The same Github location being used for Jacow, should also house the new LPR tools.	ND
5	An action document provided by EPS is needed to ensure their agreed commitments are maintained, such as the 1-wk response time.	PAM
6	IPAC20 site selection instructions posted in indico for feedback	ALL
7	Start updating the existing EPS-AG website with correct information and removing the duplicate site as indicated	PAM
8	EPS-AG were encouraged to explore and identify further communication opportunities which might be suitable to investigate	ALL
9	Assess what a topical workshop provision could look like i.e. topics, connections to other groups, structure and management, funding etc, for more extensive discussion at the next EPS-AG meeting.	ALL
10	Coordinate next board meeting for February.	PAM