

How to recognize individual scientific contributions and achievements in large collaborations?

- How can these achievements be made transparent for evaluators and committees?



- A study by JENAS: “Joint-ECFA-NuPECC-APPEC-Symposium” looking for “best practices” and “daring ideas”
 - Publications
 - Talks
 - Analysis procedures
 - Providing information
 - Promoting juniors
 - Technical and Software work
 - Governance and decision making
 - Prizes and awards
- Report with best practices and recommendations will soon be public
 - Requires ongoing developments/initiatives from community



ECFA

European Committee for Future Accelerators



NuPECC

1. The problem only exists for real large collaborations
2. Analyses and paper reviews should be shaped to fit in the time scale of PhDs/postdocs
3. Content of conference talks should be given more freedom – less prescribed by collaboration
4. (Preparational) technical/software work is insufficiently recognized in comparison with (final) analysis work
 - Conference organisers should schedule more technical/software talks
5. Technical/Software papers can/should have short author lists
6. Internal (“ana-notes”) can/should be made public
7. Awards & rewards: awards are not always good, but rewards are.

1. The problem only exists for real large collaborations
2. Analyses and paper reviews should be shaped to fit in the time scale of PhDs/postdocs
- 3.
4. **Please provide your opinion or feedback “via the Wall”.**
5. Technical/Software papers can/should have short author lists
6. Internal (“ana-notes”) can/should be made public
7. Awards & rewards: awards are not always good, but rewards are.