

# SEC Long-Term Organization

December 11th, 2020

<https://indico.fnal.gov/event/46924/>

## GENERAL AGENDA:

- Discuss potential delay of the Snowmass process and how that impacts our efforts on all fronts
- Long-Term Organization [White Paper](#) progress & to-dos ([Gantt chart](#))

**ATTENDEES:** Kristi Engel, Joshua Barrow, Garvita Agarwal, Sara Simon, Sam Homiller, Jake Bennett, Jacob Zettlemoyer

## MINUTES:

- The supported timeline we're hearing out of Rare Processes is that there will maybe be a six-month delay on the deadline for White Papers, and that the CSS will be delayed by a whole year (to July 2022)
  - ◆ This would give the Topical Group Conveners a few months to write their reports *after* the White Papers were all submitted, and a few more months after that for the Frontier-level reports to be written for discussion at the CSS
  - ◆ The Cosmic Frontier, in general, seems pretty in agreement with this kind of timeline (though less specific with the dates)
    - What they are really looking to do is not write any of the Summary Reports until the final Astro2020 report is released
- We think, besides just the original timeline being set for a non-COVID world, that it was envisioned as working for the smaller participation level of past Snowmasses
  - ◆ But the virtual nature of things allowed for a lot more participation and that level of community discussion and participation will almost necessarily stretch things out, even when there isn't a pandemic to try and work around
- What we're really hoping comes out of such an extension is more of a consensus on how to handle White Papers and the timeline for that
  - ◆ Give us a real date! A *single* actually meaningful deadline for the White Papers that if we meet means they will be given proper consideration in the Topical Group Reports
    - The current variance between Frontiers and even between Topical Groups makes it very difficult to coordinate inter-Frontier White Papers (on top of the difficulties already faced in that some of the Frontiers are not good at talking to each other)

- These differences also make it incredibly difficult for the Liaisons to do their work effectively
  - ◆ Ideally, we want guidance from the Steering Committee about this; a straightforward statement to the entire community
  - ◆ There is no reason for there not to be a single structure that no one can go around across all of Snowmass
  
- Maybe we should draft a Google Doc or something for Julia that we can send to the Snowmass Young/Early Career community with proposed language for expressing what we, as Snowmass Early Career, can do *in general*, not subject to what we can do by Frontier
  - ★ But how will we evolve in this new timeline?
- Want to consider the idea that we might use this “hiatus” to continue our efforts within the Snowmass Early Career community to set up the long-term organization
  - ◆ Not that we don’t all have other obligations, but theoretically, we now have the time we would have previously allotted to efforts within Snowmass Coordination for White Paper writing, workshops, etc.
    - And if we worked on the long-term organization earlier, we would then not have to spend as much time on it when we do need to consider the remainder of our Snowmass work
  - ◆ This would allow those of us who might have to leave because of the extended timeline to contribute as much as possible and prevent some redundancy of efforts with new members
    - Also work on recruitment and retention and leadership turnover
  - ◆ Continuing our efforts so that we were a more complete entity by the time of the CSS would allow us to be a sort of proof-of-concept for ourselves and bolster the legitimacy of our organization by showing how it could work
- In a statement to the Steering Committee, we want to outline [the Early-Career community’s] support for some kind of timeline
  - ◆ Say within this that we now have time to develop our White Paper and our organization in this intervening period such that the White Paper is a much more functional document
  
- If we’re going to use the hiatus time to develop the long-term organization, then whether or not we want to exist under DPF/as a DPF entity is still immediately relevant to us
  - ◆ Especially in the intervening period, it might be good to shackle up with DPF for stability/structure

- ◆ But, importantly, we don't want to lose the (political) power a relatively large group of Early Career people would have over budgetary things, immigration issues, etc., that DPF might not want us to opine on if we were an official subset of them
  - It would be potentially quite tricky or downright impossible to make a statement about such things under such an institution
  - And this may become especially relevant with the CSS now likely being in-person/hybrid because it may limit our ability to advocate for groups whose voices may not be as equitably heard in such a setting
- Maybe put a document about this decision up to a vote by the Early Career community (present them with all the facts, then get their feedback)?
  - ◆ Or maybe Julia could have a meeting with DPF to try and find out what some of the "fine print" of formally existing within DPF could be?
- So we'd have a document to inform the Early Career Community, and then Julia said in the [SEC Core Initiative Leadership Meeting on Dec. 4th](#) that we should have a "bulletproof proposal" to put forward to DPF... Do we want to start drafting some of these documents now so that we have a more concrete idea of what our questions and concerns would be?
  - ◆ Could we possibly talk with Priscilla Cushman or Tao Han about this and get their views on our limitations and freedoms within DPF?
  - ◆ We could try to "corner" Young-Kee Kim at the [SEC Snowmass Coordination Leadership Meeting on Dec. 18th](#) to ask her some of our questions about what our organization could do with advocacy and outreach, etc., to try and establish where our boundaries are
    - Do we maybe want to plan out some of our questions so it's readily apparent how much we've considered all this and how important it is to us?
- So, over the next week...
  - ◆ Want to draft a statement trying to represent the Early-Career perspective on the delay of the Snowmass Process
    - Maybe include an outlined timeline that we support
  - ◆ Within this document, mention the long-term organization and what we will do in the next year to prepare and work on this
    - The idea would be for Julia to deliver this to DPF
  - ◆ Also want to have a conversation with Julia to have her bring up next week with YKK the kind of "box" (or lack of "box") that we would have to live in under the DPF organization as SEC LTO
    - This would allow us to evaluate the pros and cons of existing as a DPF entity

- Would publish these pros and cons to the community so they could opine on this and we can decide from there (definitely want community input whenever feasible as we exist based on community feedback to serve the collective)
  
- Do we want to make an entry in the [delay-feedback document that Young Kee sent out](#) as the Long-Term Organization Initiative?
  - ◆ Probably not... Young Kee's document is really meant for individual feedback/comments, but we can certainly add to [Julia's](#)
- Ideally, we would want to take the contents of [Julia's document](#) and synthesize all therein into one or two paragraphs where we, as the whole of Snowmass Early Career, can make a powerful statement for Julia to put forth
  - ◆ Including statements like “Early Career members recognize that we are not as likely to be able to travel [or stay for the full duration of the CSS], so we are in support of a hybrid-style meeting if it is not fully virtual”
- Along the lines of SEC putting forth support for a hybrid meeting, we really need to think about how to maintain equity in such a situation
  - ◆ We need to come up with ideas for how to make any virtual component more realistic because if there is any chance for there to be even a partially in-person meeting, that's how it will be
    - Most people would ideally prefer in-person if for no other reason than to help with focus, but the people planning all this are perhaps remembering the past smaller Snowmasses a little too fondly to really picture how that would work for one of this size
  - ◆ Look at how (larger and probably more well-funded, but successful) other meetings have done this, such as Neutrino 2020
    - Maybe options like [Gather](#) that allow one to “walk” around a virtual room just as they would at an actual conference, and join “breakout sessions” that may be happening that they come upon, or start their own with people they come near within that virtual environment
  - ◆ So really a statement that the Early Career community is in support of novel techniques towards better participation for those who won't have the ability or means to be at the CSS for ten days
- Even just looking at how large international collaborations handle such things, as lot of problems can be mitigated just with forethought and good documentation
  - ◆ Could make sure to set up tools or documents that can be used by any attendee (virtual or in-person) to ask questions
    - Then send these questions to the person in charge of the relevant session for response in a prompt manner that is posted publicly

- ◆ Might also consider tapping people who can attend to be in-person “documenters” of the meeting
    - Minutes sometimes thought of as one’s “lifeline” during international collaboration meetings to really learn from them when not able to attend in-person
  - ◆ Or Google Docs for live editing (which we’ve already had some success with within the Snowmass process) that are prepared in advance, e.g., sets of questions to address included
- What we want out of the CSS will depend on what the CSS looks like... What will it actually be discussing?
- ◆ The CSS is meant to be a discussion/presentation of the findings of the Frontiers and their proposed plans/overall science goals
    - This may change if the timeline changes, but assuming that it just shifts and is not drastically altered, this is what it’s meant to be as of right now
- Besides these presentations, what’s the desired output of the CSS?
- ◆ The CSS informs/feeds/helps to plan the final Snowmass Report (the one that will go to P5)
- We want to try to develop solutions with the Steering Committee because we [as the Early-Career Community] will likely be a large portion of the virtual presence
- ◆ Want to also try to get Conveners who are really supportive of SEC and keeping us as involved as possible to advocate for us in this regard to make sure we are heard by the Steering Committee

## IN CLOSING:

- ★ Want to take the document Julia has been putting together, summarize it, and present the salient points for approval from the Early Career community as a whole about our thoughts on the delay and how they handle future meetings
- ★ To get at least some feedback on such a short timescale (Steering Committee meeting is *this coming Monday*), want to create a poll in Slack with some basic questions to gauge how people are feeling without requiring them to make a formal statement (want at least some numbers to back us up).
  - Support for meeting format: fully in-person vs. hybrid vs. fully virtual
  - Length of the delay of the Snowmass process: no delay vs. 3 mos. vs. 6 mos. vs. a year
  - How the delay is distributed: shift full schedule as-is vs. delay the WP deadline by x mos. and give the Conveners x more mos. to construct their reports prior to the CSS vs. stretch full schedule as-is