



SABRE: A FEW IDEAS FOR A BETTER ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLABORATION

GOAL OF THIS TALK

- SABRE is a relatively small collaboration, but:
 - Dual site → two experiments with distinct requirements
 - Three continents involved → Space and Time distance makes it harder than it could be.
- Establish ~~rules~~ **good practices** to improve the functioning of the collaboration;
 - May seem cumbersome at the beginning but in the long run it's easier to manage;
- Less discussions and more decisions:
 - Write more: written stuff is easier to share;
- Be (all) more committed:
 - One small task each will do the job;
 - Tasks are highlighted throughout the talk with the symbol 🧑🏻‍🔬

COLLABORATION MEMBERS

- Collaboration spreadsheet to be maintained in the wiki:
 - https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1p_4PZ5ByLFkGUWKnyNEL3WRwhciiQTUfJhGrnldZhds/edit#gid=2104854683
- Lists all former and present collaborators, including students, technicians., etc...
 - Keep track of the evolution of the collaboration;
- Every PI is responsible of keeping the list up to date by e-mailing changes to a **responsible person** 🧑🏻💡
 - Will be reminded to do so twice per year;
- Authorship is granted on :
 - status
 - time spent as a member of the collaboration (1 year before and 1 year after makes sense?)

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

- Spokesperson: Frank Calaprice
- Institutional Board: E. Barberio (Head), A. Ianni, C. Vignoli, C. Tomei, F. Calaprice, D. D'Angelo, A. Stuchbery, A.G. Williams, J. Mould
- Editorial Board / Speakers Bureau: M. Antonello, G. Giovanetti, A. Stuchbery, G. D'Imperio
- Scientific Secretary: **vacant**

- SABRE North Technical Coordinator: Chiara Vignoli
- SABRE North Site Manager (incl. GLIMOS): Chiara Vignoli

- SABRE South Technical Coordinator: Greg Lane
- SABRE South Site Manager: Greg Lane

IB AND OTHER BOARDS

- All matters relevant to the collaboration are discussed within the EB:
 - It might be easier if specific discussions about technical and/or organizational matters happened within boards and IB only signed off decisions;
- The only board we have now is Editorial Board/Speakers Bureau, do we need more?
 - Suggestion: Technical Board = **one responsible** for each technical item 🧐 ;
 - Proposed compositions: engineers and Technical coordinators (ad officium);
- **VERY IMPORTANT** for all boards: members **NEED TO** be active!
 - This mostly means replying to e-mails. E-mail is the easiest form of communication we have. Undended discussions, unfinished businesses and unreplied e-mails slow down the work of the entire collaboration.

COLLABORATION MEETINGS

- Endless discussions on how often we should have phone meetings and what items we should discuss;
- Nothing really effective so far;
- Last attempt in order of time: small written report from each institution.
 - you can yourself how this worked out: https://wiki.sabre-experiment.org/index.php/Common/institution_updates/september_2017
 - I'm not blaming anyone here, I'm merely pointing out that we need **someone** 🧑 to oversee the writing of regular reports and organize meetings when there is enough discussion material on the table.
- One collaboration meeting per month? See how it goes?

DECISION MAKING

- We should try to reach a final consensus/decision on every matter we discuss and avoid to keep discussing the same things all over again.
 - Write down decisions in form of policies (see talk about conferences/notes/papers)
- A simple pool within the IB with a 2/3 threshold would be enough
 - Here is where a **secretary within the IB** could also help 🧐

Scientific secretary should possibly:

- *ask people to post their reports on the wiki and make sure they do*
- *organise meetings (assist IB head)*
- *keeping tracks of decisions and/or other documents circulated within IB and Coll. calls*

MISCELLANEA: THINGS THAT NEED TO BE CARED FOR

- SABRE LNGS website: <http://sabre.lngs.infn.it/wp/>. Created by Paolo Montini upon request from INFN LNGS and CSN2, needs more work:
 - Maintenance 🧑🔧
 - Contents 🧑🔧
- Slack SABRE workspace: <https://sabre-dm.slack.com/messages/C3WDUJBC6/>
-



RULES FOR SABRE DOCUMENTS, PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCES



SABRE DOCUMENTS

- Internal slides: maintained in the wiki —> provide easy access. Now at: https://wiki.sabre-experiment.org/index.php/Meeting_Minutes_Collaboration_Calls
- Internal notes: maintained in the wiki —> provide easy access. Now at: <https://wiki.sabre-experiment.org/index.php/Common/documents>
- Public slides for conferences: maintained in the wiki —> provide easy access. Now at: https://wiki.sabre-experiment.org/index.php/Conference_List
- Publications: git repository + review
- Do we want to use a different system? docDB is an example

PROPOSAL FOR HANDLING DOCUMENTS: INTERNAL NOTES

- Authors are encouraged to provide an Internal Note describing in detail the work when it becomes mature. The note shall be posted on the Wiki and the collaboration notified. A numbering scheme for the documents will be adopted. The Editorial Board is responsible for assigning the numbers.
- This shall happen no later than 5(?) weeks before the work is targeted for presentation at a conference, in a public talk, or submitted for publication.
- The Editorial Board will appoint 1(?) reviewer within a week. The review is expected to be completed in two weeks time (path can be longer, depending on the nature of the issues encountered).
- After the review is complete, the Editorial Board will bless the new result 'official' and notify the collaboration.

PROPOSAL FOR HANDLING DOCUMENTS: SLIDES & PROCEEDINGS

- Materials for the presentation of preliminary results (conference slides typically) are examined by the Editorial Board. Slides are to be posted to the Wiki and collaboration notified at least one week before the conference.
- Same rule for proceedings.

PROPOSAL FOR HANDLING DOCUMENTS: PAPERS

- In the (highly desirable) case that a paper is also an outcome of the analysis process, the paper draft should undergo a similar review procedure as the Internal Note. In special cases where the Internal Note and the Paper draft are both available at the same time, the Paper review may proceed in parallel with the Internal Note review. The Editorial Board will inform the IB and will work to organise an expedited review.
- The Paper primary authors submit the draft to the Editorial Board. The Editorial Board:
 - assigns a Review Committee of 1 to 3 members,
 - assigns a member from the Editorial Committee as a language editor, and
 - forwards the proposed author list to the IB.
- Internal Review
 - The Review Committee provide feedback and iterate with primary authors. The first set of feedback must be provided within the first two weeks.
 - The author list must be approved by the IB. IB members may suggest additional names accompanied by a brief explanation of their contributions to the IB Chair. The primary authors work with the Editorial Board to address comments from the reviewers.
 - The Internal Review may last no longer than six (6) weeks. If the process goes longer, the Editorial Board may appoint a new review committee.

PROPOSAL FOR HANDLING DOCUMENTS: PAPERS (2)

➤ Collaboration Review

- Once approved by the Review Committee, the Editorial Board releases the paper to the Collaboration for a collaboration-wide review. The date the Editorial Board releases the paper to the Collaboration is used for the cut-off date for the Author List.
- Collaborators must send in their initial comments within 2 weeks. No new issues will be accepted after the initial 2 weeks.
- The paper may be retracted by the primary authors if a significant error or deficiency is revealed at this point. The cut-off date is also retracted. The paper may go back to the draft stage or to internal review, whichever is appropriate.
- If the paper is not submitted within 3 months of the start of the Collaboration Review, the Editorial Board must retract the paper from the Collaboration Review and it goes back to Internal Review. The author list cut-off date is also reset.
- The Editorial Board, in consultation with the IB, has the authority to approve the paper for submission once all reasonable and timely comments from the collaboration are addressed.