DØ International participation

H. Weerts

Argonne National Lab. &

Previously Dzero (1983-2004)

Some history

It has been a long time....

Timeline of Dzero

1983 Start Dzero-- first meeting at SUNY Stony Brook

.....

1991 Detector complete Start Run I

1997 End Run I

Major upgrade of Tevatron complex & detectors--- more physics

2001 Start Run II

.....

2011 End of Run II/Tevatron

Some history

Timeline of Dzero

1983 Start Dzero-- first meeting at SUNY Stony Brook

.....

1992 Detector complete Start Run I

1996 End Run I

Major upgrade of Tevatron complex & detectors--- more physics

2001 Start Run II

.....

2011 End of Run II/Tevatron

Evolution of Dzero collaboration

13 US institutions + 1 France; 89 collaborators

...... a US collaboration

New collaboration after Top discovery-- growing

Create governance document

49 institutions; 427 collaborators; 19 non-US

An international collaboration at Fermilab

.....

Migration to LHC starts

76 institutions; 39 non-US

=> People follow physics potential

1984 Design report

14 Institutions89 members

Brookhaven National Laboratory

Brown University

Columbia University

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

Florida State University

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

University of Maryland

Michigan State University

Northwestern University

University of Pennsylvania

DAPNIA/SPP-CE Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

State University of New York, Stony Brook

Virginia Polytechnic Institute

D0 more international '84 → '97

1997: 49 Institutions 427 members

Universidad de los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

University of Arizona

Boston University

Brookhaven National Laboratory

Brown University

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

University of California, Davis

University of California, Irvine

University of California, Riverside

LAFEX, Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas,

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

CINVESTAV, Mexico City, Mexico

Columbia University

Delhi University, Delhi, India

JINR Dubna, Russia

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

Florida State University

University of Hawaii

University of Illinois at Chicago

Indiana University

iowa State University

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

Kyungsung University, Pusan, Korea

Institute of Nuclear Physics, Krakow, Poland

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

University of California, Berkeley

University of Maryland

University of Michigan

Michigan State University

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics,

Moscow, Russia

Moscow State University, Russia

University of Nebraska

Lehman review March 1997

Upgrade

New York University Northeastern University Northern Illinois University Northwestern University University of Notre Dame

University of Oklahoma

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg,

Russia

Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

Purdue University Rice University

Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

University of Rochester

DAPNIA/SPP-CE Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea State University of New York, Stony Brook

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India

University of Texas, Arlington

Texas A&M University

DoE Review March 1997

One institution from France so far....

Continue to grow.... Especially when Run II became a reality

2012- stable for a long time; only growth because people move



AZ U. of Arizona

CA U. of California, Riverside

FL Florida State U.

IL Fermilab

U. of Illinois, Chicago Northern Illinois U.

Northwestern U

IN Indiana U

U. of Notre Dame Purdue U. Calumet

IA Iowa State U.

KS U. of Kansas Kansas State U.

LA Louisiana Tech U.

MD U. of Maryland

MA Boston U.

Northeastern U.

MI U. of Michigan Michigan State U.

MS U. of Mississippi

NE U. of Nebraska

NJ Princeton U.

Rutgers U.

NY Brookhaven Nat. Lab.

Columbia U.

SUNY, Buffalo

SUNY, Stony Brook U. of Rochester

OK Langston U.

U. of Oklahoma

Oklahoma State U. RI Brown U

TX Southern Methodist U.

U. of Texas at Arlington

Rice U. VA U. of Virginia

WA U. of Washington



LAFEX, CBPF, Rio de Janeiro State U. do Rio de Janeiro U. Federal do ABC, São Paulo



U. of Science and Technology of China, Hefei



U. de los Andes, Bogotá



Charles U., Prague Czech Tech. U., Prague Academy of Sciences, Prague



U. San Francisco de Quito



LPC, Clermont-Ferrand ISN, IN2P3, Grenoble CPPM, IN2P3, Marseille LAL, IN2P3, Orsay LPNHE, IN2P3, Paris DAPNIA/SPP, CEA, Saclay IReS, Strasbourg IPN, IN2P3, Villeurbanne



RWTH Aachen Bonn U. Freiburg U. Göttingen U. Mainz U. LMU München Wuppertal U.



Panjab U. Chandigarh Delhi U., Delhi Tata Institute, Mumbai

The DØ Collaboration



University College, Dublin



KDL, Korea U., Seoul



CINVESTAV, Mexico City



FOM-NIKHEF, Amsterdam U. of Amsterdam / NIKHEF U. of Nilmegen / NIKHEF



PNPI, St. Petersburg

JINR, Dubna ITEP, Moscow Moscow State U. IHEP, Protvino



ICREA/IFAE, U. de Barcelona



Stockholm U. Uppsala U.



National U. of Kiev



Imperial College London Lancaster U. U. of Manchester

Ann Heinson, UC Riverside

Some concerted effort to increase collaboration Paris, March 1997

DØ France

H. Wahl

DO Meeting in Paris: Tentative Agenda

Monday, March 24, 1997

9:30 10:00	Overview of Workshop; Tevatron & Detector upgrades	H. Montgomery
10:00 11:00	DZero Upgrade	M. Tuts
11:00 12:00	Physics Program in Run II	P. Grannis
12:00 12:45	Possibilities for Participation, Overview	H. Weerts
12:45 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 14:45	Calorimeter Upgrade, Status, Opportunities	D. Schamberger
14:45 16:30	adjourn for Veneziano talk	
16.45 17.30	Trigger Ungrade Status Opportunities	T Blazev

17:30 -- 18:15 Impact Parameter Trigger, Status, Opportunities. 19:00 Working Dinner

Tuesday, March 25, 1997

9:30 10:30	Online/Offline/Analysis Computing, Status, Opportunities	W. Merritt
10:30 11:15	Run I Thesis Opportunities	M. Strovink
11:15 12:00	Concluding Remarks	H. Montgomery
12:00 13:30	Lunch	

13:30 -- 15:30 Working Meeting on agreeing conclusions.

Discussion reservee aux groupe francais; reaction a chaud, strategie a suivre, etc. 16:00 ---

Outline status of DO; possibilities for collaboration, address any concerns (Run I Theses)

Attendance ~ 30 people incl. DØ people.

DØ France

New DØ France institutions (Jan. 1998):

Officially in DO

Add the new IN2P3 institutions from France.

The IN2P3 institutions are LAL Orsay, CPPM Marseille, ISN

Grenoble and Paris VI-VII.

The contact people are:

Marseille

Orsay

Paris VI-VII

Took ~ 1year

Feb 1999: Add Grenoble,

April 2000: Add Lyon,

2001: Add Strasbourg,

Interesting how IN2P3 joined DØ.

(Separate talk about contributions)

Decisions 1998 & beyond

DØ more of Europe

Series of seminars at: Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, Belgium and UK.

People are interested especially:

Physics potential Need results for people's career- young people at start

By 2001:

Multiple groups from above countries joined----# non-US groups > # US groups

We encouraged them to be organized by "country" i.e. pull resources

Many people who took jump, now have staff/faculty positions

LBNE Questions asked

- 1. The collaboration rules specific to international partnership
- 2. The agreements with international partners and how they were reached, who participated in these agreements,
- 3. What was the actual implementation of the agreements?
- 4. What changes had to be made to agreements during implementation.
- 5. The relationship between the agencies, laboratories, and collaboration, etc.

LBNE Questions asked-- answers

1. The collaboration rules specific to international partnership

There were no specific rules. Each institution (US or non - US judged on proposed contribution to Dzero. Follow collaboration procedures.

2. The agreements with international partners and how they were reached, who participated in these agreements,

This was done through institutional/individual contacts, but in the end the spokespeople became and were involved Plus MoUs were signed with all non-US groups to put basic principles in writing.

3. What was the actual implementation of the agreements?

Had MoUs during Run II specifying participation in running, computing and analysis and followed Dzero governance written procedures.

LBNE Questions asked-- answers

4. What changes had to be made to agreements during implementation.

Not quite sure here. When needed MoUs were updated. Governance and other documents (authorship rules) were/are "living" documents i.e. they are updated as needed.

5. The relationship between the agencies, laboratories, and collaboration, etc.

Dzero international relations remained very informal during Run II; no real contracts until Dzero asked for contributions to operations.

Finance committee never brought large amounts of actual funding.

All aspects handles through spokes -- agencies & NSF, DOE (keep them up to date and informed)

This was very different when "Upgrade" was a project. More formal through project management.

The End