

Governance Document Review Interim Report

Lisa Whitehead Koerner
for the committee

DUNE IB Meeting
August 16, 2017

Governance Document Review

- Committee Members: **Dominique Duchesneau, Carlos Escobar, Lisa Whitehead Koerner (chair), Christopher Mauger, Michel Sorel, Jason Stock**
- Purpose: The Collaboration Governance Document (CGD) was created shortly after the collaboration formed two years ago. The IB chair established this ad-hoc committee to perform a review of the document to determine if fine-tuning is needed and to address a few known items, such as inconsistencies with the LBNF/DUNE Project Management Plan (PMP) and DUNE Management Plan (DMP) and unanticipated situations not addressed by the CGD, e.g. withdrawals from elected positions before the end of normal term.

Committee Activity

- Committee formed in May 2017
- Phone meeting with IB chair May 11
- In-person meeting during collaboration meeting on May 18; attended by three members of the committee that wrote the CDG
- Review by committee members
 - Solicited comments from IB; one member responded
- Phone meeting on June 18 to discuss the comments
- Phone meeting on June 30 to discuss the report
- Submitted report to IB chair on July 10
- IB chair submitted report to IB on July 19
 - Received comments from one IB member on the report

The Report

- Summarizes the committee's opinions on what should be changed in the CGD
- Divided into two sections
 - Substantial issues that the IB should discuss today
 - Non-controversial changes the committee recommends
 - Correcting obviously incorrect information
 - For example, the Finance Board, which doesn't exist
 - Implementing new procedures for spokesperson stepping down, IB chair stepping down, etc
 - Getting rid of historical language (that describes how things started, when the document went into effect, ELBNF, etc.)
 - Changing 4-week review periods to 2 weeks
 - Adding attachments that describe speakers committee, etc
- **Please read if you haven't!!!!**

Discussion Items

- Definition of collaboration membership
- Option to remove a collaborator
- Require IB motions to be seconded
- Option to remove IB chair
- Role of Co-spokesperson search committee
- Role of executive committee
- Other?

Membership: Delete reference to ELBNF letter of intent; state explicitly that members must be affiliated with a DUNE institution

Art.2.1, Membership of the DUNE Collaboration

Current: “The founding membership of the DUNE collaboration comprises all individuals who signed the Letter of Intent, “An Experimental Program in Neutrinos, Nucleon Decay and Astroparticle Physics Enabled by the Fermilab Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility”, submitted to the Fermilab Program Advisory Committee on December 22, 2014, or subsequently requested to be added to the collaboration list. They must have also agreed to participate in the DUNE experiment and belong to academic institutions that have at least one faculty member (or equivalent) with intention of making relevant contributions to the DUNE experiment.”

Proposed:

Option A: “Members of the DUNE Collaboration must be affiliated with collaborating institutions. The list of DUNE Collaboration members is maintained by the IB Chair.”

Explanation: Since the collaboration is established, there is no longer any reason to describe the founding membership of the collaboration, only what defines the current membership. State explicitly that members must be affiliated with a DUNE institution.

Membership: Another option, adding language for eligibility, responsibilities and rights.

Option B: “Individuals who contribute significantly to the DUNE Experiment, as well as those who contribute significantly to the LBNF facility required for DUNE, are eligible to be members of the DUNE Collaboration. Members of the DUNE Collaboration must be affiliated with collaborating institutions, and must adhere to the policies adopted by the Institutional Board. The list of DUNE Collaboration members is maintained by the IB Chair. Changes to this list can only be made by each institution’s representative in the IB. Collaboration members have access rights to DUNE/LBNF data as well as to various collaborative tools and resources, including document databases, software code repositories, mailing lists, and computing resources.”

Explanation: Same as option A, plus added language for collaborators’ eligibility, responsibilities, and rights.

Removing an individual collaborator: We currently have the right to remove an institution due to inactivity; do we want the possibility to remove an individual collaborator?

Article 2.4, Add option to remove an individual collaborator.

Option A:

Current: “2.4 Removal of Institutions from DUNE”

Proposed: “2.4 Removal of Institutions or Collaboration members from DUNE”

Current: “Removal of an institution from DUNE can be proposed by any IB or EC members for the institution’s actions that are judged to be gravely detrimental to the experiment or for the institution’s extreme inactivity in the experiment (more than one year).”

Proposed: “Removal of an institution or collaboration member from DUNE can be proposed by any IB or EC members for the institution’s or member’s actions that are judged to be gravely detrimental to the experiment or for the institution’s or member’s extreme inactivity in the experiment (more than one year).”

Option B: No change

Explanation: We could give the option to remove an individual collaborator, rather than an entire institution.

IB meeting procedure: Require motions to be seconded before a vote?

Article 3.3, Require motions at IB meetings to be seconded.

Option A: Add to Article 3.3 “Any motion made at an IB meeting requires the motion be seconded by another IB member in order to go forward.”

Option B: No change.

Explanation: Requiring that a motion be seconded is common in other IBs, and it’s a good mechanism to prevent personal issues interfering with objective judgement by IB members.

Removing an IB chair: We currently have the right to remove co-spokespersons, the deputy spokesperson, and institutions, but no possibility to remove an IB chair.

Article 3.4, Include the possibility of removing an IB chair.

Option A: Add to Article 3.4 “The IB chair can be removed at any time by the IB by a secret ballot of at least 2/3 of the sum of those present at a regularly scheduled Institutional Board meeting. The quorum for the vote is a 2/3 majority of the entire IB membership. A two-week notice is required for a vote for removal and such a vote will be taken if at least five IB members propose such a vote to the IB. One of the IB members proposing the vote will conduct the vote. In the event of a removal, the open position will be filled following the procedure described above. The newly elected IB Chair will have a term that includes the remaining term of the removed IB Chair in addition to the nominal two-year term.”

Option B: No change.

Explanation: There is currently no way to remove an IB chair. There might be situations where the ability to remove an IB Chair is desirable – for example, if the IB Chair stops organizing IB meetings. The current version of the CGD does include provisions on how to remove Co-spokespersons, the Deputy Spokesperson, and institutions.

Removing an IB chair: We currently have the right to remove co-spokespersons, the deputy spokesperson, and institutions, but no possibility to remove an IB chair.

Comment from Alfons:

You say: “The quorum for the vote is a 2/3 majority of the entire IB membership.”

My understanding of a quorum is a minimum number of people voting. I therefore think the word “majority” is not needed.

Note: The language was copied from the section on removal of a co-spokesperson, so if we change it here, we should change it there as well

Role of co-spokesperson search committee:

- Do we want the committee to carry out a down-selection of candidates, or not?
- Explicitly state that the Director has to approve of our spokesperson selection

Current language is:

Article 4.2, Role of the Co-Spokesperson Search Committee (CSSC) and issue of lab director approval
Current: “The IB Chair will initiate the election process by establishing a Co-Spokesperson Search Committee (CSSC). The composition of the search committee will be proposed by the IB chair and will be approved by the IB. The CSSC members may not stand for the election. The committee will choose its own chair. CSSC will then receive nominations from all eligible voters (up to three nominations per nominator). The committee will contact all nominees with three or more nominations to produce an initial list of candidates who are willing to stand for the election. The committee will then interview the candidates and produce a short list (nominally comprises three candidates) which will be presented to the collaboration for a general election. In this process, the committee will seek input from the host lab Director.”

Role of co-spokesperson search committee:

- Do we want the committee to carry out a down-selection of candidates, or not?
- Explicitly state that the Director has to approve of our spokesperson selection

Explanation: There are two issues the committee is seeking to address with these optional revisions. 1) The committee felt the IB should revisit the discussion of the role of the CSSC in Co-Spokesperson elections, in particular whether or not the CSSC should have the power to make a short list of candidates from all the nominees. Currently, the CSSC does have this power and it was exercised in the last election. In Option A, the operation of the CSSC does not change, but Option B changes the CSSC to a committee that carries out the election, but does not play a role in choosing the candidates. 2) The other issue is that DUNE/LBNF Project Management Plan says “Fermilab, as host lab, will also provide oversight of the DUNE collaboration and detector construction project through: ... approving the selection of collaboration Spokespersons.” The same language is used in the DUNE Management Plan. The current version of the CGD says the CSSC will “seek input” from the Director when producing the short list, but does not explicitly say that the Director must approve the selection. The committee felt that if the collaboration agrees that spokespersons must be approved by the host lab Director, then this should be stated explicitly in our governance document. The “seek input” language leaves some ambiguity, and therefore seems inconsistent with the DUNE Management Plan. Both options A and B incorporate explicit language on lab Director approval of the Co-Spokespersons.

Role of co-spokesperson search committee:

- Do we want the committee to carry out a down-selection of candidates, or not?
- Explicitly state that the Director has to approve of our spokesperson selection

Language to make the down-select clear:

Option A (the CSSC carries out a downselect)

“The IB Chair will initiate the election process by establishing a Co-Spokesperson Search Committee (CSSC). The composition of the search committee will be proposed by the IB chair and will be approved by the IB. The CSSC members may not stand for the election. The committee will choose its own chair. The CSSC will then receive nominations from all eligible voters. Each eligible voter may make up to three nominations. The CSSC will contact all nominees with three or more nominations to produce an initial list of candidates who are willing to stand for the election. The CSSC will then interview the candidates and produce a short list comprised of three candidates. The FNAL director will approve the list. In the case one or more nominees are rejected by the director, the CSSC will replace the rejected candidates with others from the initial list of candidates. The list will again be submitted to the FNAL director for approval. This process will repeat until there are three candidates approved by the FNAL director or until the list of candidates is exhausted. The final list will be presented to the collaboration for a general election.”

Role of co-spokesperson search committee:

- Do we want the committee to carry out a down-selection of candidates, or not?
- Explicitly state that the Director has to approve of our spokesperson selection

Language with no down-select:

Option B (No downselect, so the CSSC does not carry out a downselect)

“The IB Chair will initiate the election process by establishing a Co-Spokesperson Search Committee (CSSC). The composition of the search committee will be proposed by the IB chair and will be approved by the IB. The CSSC members may not stand for the election. The committee will choose its own chair. The CSSC will then receive nominations from all eligible voters. Each eligible voter may make up to three nominations. The CSSC will contact all nominees with three or more nominations to produce an initial list of candidates who are willing to stand for the election. The FNAL director will approve the list. The final list is comprised of nominees on the initial list who are not rejected by the FNAL director. The final list will be presented to the collaboration for a general election.”

Option C: No change

For this option, we also want to make it clear that the role of the committee is to ensure that there are *no fewer* than 3 candidates.

Role of executive committee: advisory body or decision-making body?

Art.6.1, Role of the Executive Committee

Current: “The Executive Committee is responsible for setting scientific and technical objectives and priorities of the DUNE collaboration taking account of the financial aspects as well as other resources. The EC establishes procedures for making technical choices, and will oversee progress and developments in various projects. The EC will also advise the Co-Spokespersons on all major collaboration matters.”

Proposed:

Option A: EC as primary decision-making body of the collaboration

“The Executive Committee is responsible for setting scientific and technical objectives and priorities of the DUNE collaboration taking account of the financial aspects as well as other resources. The EC establishes procedures for making technical choices, and will oversee progress and developments in various projects. The EC is the primary decision-making body of the collaboration. The EC decision-making process is described in the DUNE Management Plan (see Attachment A.2).”

Option B: No change

Explanation: Currently, the CGD describes the role of the EC as an advisory body to the spokespersons. The text of the DUNE Management Plan describes the EC the main decision-making body. It would be good to clarify whether or not the EC’s main role is to advise or to make decisions.

Comment from Alfons:

Page 4, preamble.

I believe and that was the discussion when we gave DUNE its name, that DUNE is the name of the experiment and not an acronym. Yes, one can find matching letters so that it could be an acronym, but it isn't. As such we should NOT define DUNE to be an acronym in the CGD.

Current: "The DUNE experiment is..."

Proposed: "The Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE) is ..."

Explanation: Define the acronym.

Other Thoughts?