

ALICE Organization

Revision 12

In this document the following subjects are covered:

I - General.....	1
Membership of the Collaboration	1
Rights and duties of ALICE Member.....	1
New Members of the Collaboration.....	1
Suspension of Membership	1
Associate Membership	2
Non-Fulfilment of Obligations.....	2
Plenary Meeting	2
II - Collaboration Board	3
Role	3
Membership and voting rights	3
Chairperson and Deputy	3
Meetings	3
Decisions	4
Elections	4
Agenda and Minutes	5
III - Management Structures.....	6
General	6
Management Board	6
Technical Board.....	7
Finance Board.....	7
Physics Board	8
Offline Board	8
Editorial Board	9
Conference Committee.....	9
IV - Management Functions.....	10
General Rules.....	10
Spokesperson and Deputy.....	10
Coordinators	10
Technical Coordinator.....	10
Resources Coordinator.....	11
Physics Coordinator	11
Offline Coordinator	11
Trigger Coordinator	11
Run Coordination	12
Upgrade Coordinator.....	12
Other Coordinators.....	12
Project Leaders	12
ANNEX 1 – Duties of ALICE members.....	13
ANNEX 2 – ALICE Publication Policy	15

I - General

The purpose of the ALICE Collaboration (the 'Collaboration') is to construct and maintain the ALICE detector for the study of nucleus-nucleus collisions as well as proton-proton and proton-nucleus collisions at the CERN Large Hadron Collider and to exploit it for fundamental physics research according to the physics objectives of the Collaboration. The objectives further include a development of upgrade plans and implementation as demanded by physics considerations.

The present design of the detector is described in the ALICE Technical Proposal (CERN/LHCC 95-71) and its Addenda (CERN/LHC 96-32, CERN/LHCC 99-13, CERN/LHCC 2001-021, CERN/LHCC 2002-016 AND CERN/LHCC 2006-014), and its Upgrade (CERN-LHCC-2012-02).

The rules governing the Collaboration and the relations between Institutes, Funding Agencies and CERN as well as the responsibilities of these parties for the construction of the detector are contained in the ALICE Memorandum of Understanding (ALICE RRB-D 00-41) and its amendments and addenda, as well as in the Memorandum of Understanding for the Maintenance and the Operation of the ALICE Detector (ALICE RRB-2002-034) and in the Memorandum of Understanding for Computing (ALICE RRB-2005-007).

Membership of the Collaboration

Member Institutes ('Institutes') of the Collaboration are those Institutes that have been accepted as such by the Collaboration Board (CB). Each Institute's representative ('Team Leaders'), should register in the ALICE Collaboration DataBase (ACDB) the members of his/her team spending a dominant fraction of their time working for the Collaboration. Persons registered in the ACDB are Members of the Collaboration.

Rights and duties of ALICE Member

Members of the Collaboration have access to all data taken by the experiment. In addition all analysis and simulation code must be available to every member for review and use.

Members of the Collaboration are required to participate in taking shifts in the running of the experiment, in the physics exploitation, and provide service work for the Collaboration. Detailed duties are lay down in Annex 1.

It is the duty of each team leader to enter information on PhD thesis performed within his/her team in the ALICE Collaboration database. In addition team leaders should ensure that service work as specified in Annex 1 is carried out for the Collaboration.

The Publication Policy is in Annex 2.

New Members of the Collaboration

The candidature of new Institutes is first considered by the Management Board (MB) upon recommendation of the Spokesperson. Once the MB decides that sufficient information is available on the institute's intended participation, the MB presents the candidature to the CB for a vote.

An entry fee of a minimum amount of 50'000 CHF applies for new Institutes joining the Collaboration with the status of full member.

Transfer of a full group to a different location does not require re-payment of the entry fee.

Members from a new Institute, associated to an existing one, which would remain sole representative in the Collaboration Board also does not require the payment of the entry fee. The latter would have to take the responsibility for the payment of the M&O-A for the new Institute.

Suspension of Membership

Membership of an Institute may be suspended by the CB in exceptional circumstances to allow an Institute to temporarily interrupt contributions to the Collaboration. After a maximum of 3 years of suspended membership, the CB decides to reintegrate or exclude the Institute. Upon return to full membership, all duties that were outstanding at the moment of the suspension have to be fulfilled on an agreed schedule.

Associate Membership

The status of Associate Member Institute ('Associate Institute') of the Collaboration may be granted to institutes which are not, or not yet, able to enter into a long term commitment to the experiment, or to Institutes specifically interested in particular technological developments.

Duties for associate members are specified in a Memorandum of Understanding between the Institute and the Spokesperson, and the Chair of the Collaboration Board.

Members of Associate Institutes will generally not automatically be included as authors of publications of the Collaboration. In specific cases they may be included as authors in papers related to their field of activity. Final decisions on authorship rest with the ALICE Editorial Board.

Associate Institutes of the Collaboration are represented at the CB without voting rights.

The mechanism for the admission of Associate Institutes is the same as for ordinary Institutes of the Collaboration. The status of Associate Institute is reviewed annually, in October by the MB and by the CB during the Fall meeting.

Non-Fulfilment of Obligations

If an Institute or Associate Institute does not fulfil the obligations specified in the Memoranda of Understanding for Construction (ALICE RRB-D 00-41) and for the Maintenance and the Operation of the detector (ALICE RRB-2002-034), and the ones further decided by the CB, as specified in Annex 1, the MB will consider the case and recommend a decision to the CB. The detailed obligations for ALICE members are specified in Annex 1. Among the decisions of the CB in such cases may be withdrawal of the Institute's voting right in the CB, and withdrawal of the rights of the members of the team to sign ALICE scientific papers, and ultimately, the exclusion of the Institute or Associate Institute from the Collaboration.

In all such cases, the representative of the Institute or Associate Institute concerned must be given the opportunity to be heard.

Plenary Meeting

The full Collaboration has periodic meetings (ALICE weeks) at least 3 times a year. The general assembly, the ALICE Plenary Meeting, meets at these occasions. Plenary Meetings are open to all Members of the Collaboration. The Plenary Meeting may take the form of open meetings of the Physics Forum and of the Technical Forum ('ALICE Forum').

All major topics related to physics, including all new scientific results before they are shown to the public, as well as technical issues about the detector and its upgrade are presented to the Plenary Meeting.

II - Collaboration Board

Role

The Collaboration Board (CB) is the ultimate policy- and decision making body of the Collaboration.

Membership and voting rights

The CB is composed of one representative from each Institute (Full or Associate Member). CB Members may appoint a member of the ALICE Collaboration to replace them in the CB meeting.

In addition to institutes' representatives, the CB is composed of the CB Chair and his/her deputies, the Spokesperson and his/her deputies, all members of the Management Board and three ALICE junior members.

ALICE junior members (less than 5 years after their PhD at the time of the election, or 8 years since their University degree) are from amongst the members of ALICE. At least one of the ALICE junior members should be a doctoral student. The ALICE junior members should organize appropriate elections for the selection of the three ALICE junior members of the CB. ALICE junior members are members of the CB for a period of two years non renewable.

Voting rights are based on the list of PhD or equivalent qualification. This list is established annually prior to the fall RRB, with effective date September 1, and is valid for the following calendar year. Each Institute with a minimum of 3 Members (scientific staff holding PhD or equivalent qualifications), as defined in the Memorandum of Understanding for Maintenance and Operations (CERN-RRB-2002034), has one vote in the CB. Institutes may join together to pass the threshold of 3 Members as defined above, so they will have one vote. The Institutes should explicitly indicate their common representative at the fall meeting of the CB and it will be valid for the course of the following year. The 3 ALICE junior members have full voting rights. At any time, the sum of institutes with voting rights and groups qualifying for a vote, established at the above date, together with the 3 ALICE junior representatives, constitutes the total number of all possible votes in the CB.

The CB Chair and his/her deputies do not vote. The Spokesperson and his/her deputies are ex-officio members of the CB without voting rights.

Other members of the Management Board (MB) are ex-officio Members of the CB and do not vote unless they are at the same time Institute Representatives.

Chairperson and Deputy

The Chairperson and the Deputy Chairperson(s) of the CB shall not represent any country, institution, or interest group within ALICE.

The Chairperson of the ALICE CB is elected ad personam by the CB. The duration of the mandate is 3 years, not renewable.

The CB Chairperson nominates one or two Deputies for endorsement by the CB. The mandate of the Deputy(ies) may not exceed the end of the mandate of the Chairperson. The CB Chair also nominates a CB secretary to be endorsed by the CB.

The process leading to the nomination of the Chairperson candidates is organized by Members of the Collaboration appointed by the CB.

Meetings

The CB assembles during the ALICE weeks. Additional meetings may be called by the CB Chairperson as the need arises.

Decisions

Decisions in the CB:

- require the presence of a quorum of at least 50% of the voting Institutes (joined institutes count as 1) (including procurations);
- are taken by consensus whenever possible or otherwise by vote;
- require a 2/3 majority of the quorum represented during the vote.

CB members with voting rights may delegate their vote to another member of the ALICE Collaboration. Voting representatives may carry up to two procurations in addition to their own vote.

Unless specifically requested by the quorum or the CB Chair, all votes are open.

Should a situation arise, whereby a decision cannot be reached by the above voting procedure, a second vote will be scheduled for a subsequent meeting of the CB, but not before the following day. The matter will then be decided by a simple majority of the quorum.

Changes of the ALICE Constitution and annexes require a 2/3 majority of the number of all possible votes.

Exceptionally, decisions can be made by electronic ballot and require a 2/3 majority of the number of all possible votes.

Elections

The Collaboration Board elects:

- the Spokesperson;
- the Chair of the Collaboration Board;
- four members of the Management Board.

Candidates for the Spokesperson and the CB Chair will be sought by search committees, which are nominated by the CB Chair.

Nominations of candidates for the MB are solicited by and submitted to the CB Chair by the members of the CB with voting rights. The proposals can be transmitted to the CB Chair at any time. Proposals need to be seconded by at least one other institution and will subsequently be discussed at the CB meeting prior to voting.

Elections require a quorum of at least 2/3 of the number of all possible votes (including procurations).

CB members with voting rights may delegate their vote to another member of the ALICE Collaboration. Voting representatives may carry up to two procurations in addition to their own vote.

Elections are carried out by secret ballot.

The Spokesperson and the Chair of the CB are elected with a 2/3 majority.

ALICE Collaboration

Voting commences on the Wednesday of the ALICE week. In case none of the candidates for Spokesperson or CB Chair receives a 2/3 majority, the vote is resumed on the Friday of the same ALICE week. If a 2/3 majority is not reached then, voting will be postponed until the following ALICE week.

Elections for MB positions are always organized for each position separately. Election proceeds by elimination of the candidate with the lowest number of votes until a 2/3 majority on one name is reached.

Agenda and Minutes

The agenda for the CB is prepared by the Chairperson in collaboration with the Spokesperson and the Secretary of the CB. Any member of the CB may request additional topics to be included.

The proceedings of the CB are recorded in minutes. Draft minutes are circulated to members of the CB for approval at the next meeting.

III - Management Structures

General

The management structure of ALICE includes four levels of decision-making. At decreasing level of responsibility these levels are:

- Collaboration Board;
- Management Board;
- Technical Board, Finance Board, Offline Board, Physics Board;
- Project level.

At the three levels below the Collaboration Board, the following actions may be taken, depending on the importance and implications of the matter:

- final decisions;
- decisions to be endorsed by the next higher level;
- proposals or recommendations to the next level;
- referral of the matter to the next level without taking position.

The Project Leader or chair of the relevant board decides on a case-by-case basis which of these actions is appropriate. In exceptional cases, this classification can be overruled at a higher level.

Management Board

The ALICE Management Board (MB), through the Spokesperson, is responsible for directing the ALICE experiment.

All important matters of scientific, technical, organizational and financial nature shall be discussed in the MB. Important decisions have to be submitted to the CB for endorsement.

The MB in particular:

- prepares decisions and makes recommendations to the CB;
- endorses Project Leaders on proposal by the Projects;
- has the mandate to resolve controversies within or between the Projects.

Decisions are taken by consensus as documented in the minutes. If no consensus can be reached, the matter is referred to the CB.

The composition of the MB is decided by the CB.

The MB is currently composed of:

- Four Members elected 'ad personam'.
- The following projects are represented by their Project Leaders: ITS, TPC, TOF, TRD, EMCal, PHOS and Muon Arm, as well as DAQ, Trigger, and HLT. The remaining detectors are represented by one of their Project Leaders, appointed by consensus.
- Ex-officio Members of the MB are the Spokesperson and Deputy(is), the Collaboration Board Chairperson and Deputy(ies), the Technical Coordinator, the Resources Coordinator, the Physics Coordinator and the Offline Coordinator.
- Trigger Coordinator, Run Coordinator, Upgrade Coordinator, Chairs of EB and CC are in general invited by the MB Chair.

The spokesperson may invite additional members of the Collaboration if appropriate.

The duration of the mandate of the four members elected ad personam is 3 years, not renewable.

The meetings of the MB are chaired by the Spokesperson, and restricted to members of MB or persons explicitly invited by the Spokesperson.

The MB meets about once a month. The dates are proposed for the running calendar year and agreed by the MB. The Spokesperson may call for extraordinary meetings of the MB to deal with specific or urgent topics.

The work and the decisions of the MB are recorded in minutes, which are made available to the Collaboration.

Technical Board

The Technical Board (TB) is the principal steering group in all matters of technical coordination.

The TB is composed of the Project Leaders (PLs) and Subproject Leaders (SPLs) and other Coordinators defined by the MB or the TB. Members of the MB, the Deputy Technical Coordinator, Spokesperson and Deputy(ies) and the Resources Coordinator are ex-officio members of the TB.

In the spirit of the mandate of Technical Coordinator (TC) the PLs and SPLs work together with and report to the TC on all issues covered by the mandate of the TC. The TC may set up, in consultation with the TB and on an ad-hoc basis, special working groups or task forces to address specific technical issues or advise on certain technical solutions.

The TB is authorised to take technical decisions, which the TB deems not to have a significant impact on performance or cost of the ALICE Detector. More important technical decisions are prepared in the form of a proposal by the TB for discussion at and action by the MB.

The TB shall attempt to reach a consensus on decisions and the preparation of proposals. If no consensus can be reached the matter is referred to the MB. Important decisions of the TB will be presented to the MB for endorsement.

The TB is chaired by the Technical Coordinator or in his absence by the Deputy Technical Coordinator.

The TB meets regularly, typically once a month. Dates are proposed for the running calendar year and agreed by the TB. The meetings are synchronised to the MB meetings. During the ALICE Weeks the 'ALICE Forum' discusses issues of general interest. The TC may call for extraordinary meetings of the TB to deal with specific or urgent topics.

A draft agenda is circulated two weeks and a final agenda one week before a TB meeting.

The work and the decisions of the TB are recorded in minutes, which are made available to the Collaboration.

Finance Board

The Finance Board (FB) is responsible for dealing with all matters related to the costs and resources of the Collaboration, evaluation of contributions, relations with Funding Agencies, contract policy, and all administrative matters. FB decisions with important implications for the Collaboration must be presented to the CB for endorsement.

The FB is chaired by the Resources Coordinator. Members are the ALICE representatives of the national Funding Agencies. Ex-officio Members are the Spokesperson and Deputy(ies), the CB Chairperson and Deputy(ies), the Technical Coordinator and the Offline Coordinator.

Physics Board

The Physics Board (PB) co-ordinates and assesses activities concerning physics topics of interest. It acts also, in close connection with the Editorial Board and Conference Committee (EB, CC), as the steering group for the preparation of physics publications, notes and oral presentations.

The Physics Coordinator proposes in consultation with the Spokesperson the organization of the Physics Board to the Management Board for confirmation. ALICE physics is organized in Working Groups (PWG), each group being composed of two Convenors and of Collaboration Members contributing to the specific field.

The PB is composed of the Physics Coordinator, his/her deputies, four to six physicists appointed ad personam, and the conveners of the WGs. The Spokesperson and his/her deputies are ex-officio members of the PB. The meetings of the PB are chaired by the Physics Coordinator.

The ad personam members of the PB are appointed for a term of three years, not renewable. They are nominated by the Spokesperson in consultation with the Physics Coordinator and the MB and endorsed by the CB.

The PWG Conveners are appointed for one term of two years, not renewable. The mandates of the two conveners of a PWG are typically shifted by one year. The conveners are proposed by the corresponding PWG members and nominated by the Physics Coordinator in consultation with the Spokesperson and the MB for endorsement by the CB. Every Member of the Collaboration willing to contribute to the PWG is eligible.

The number of PWGs is not limited and corresponds to the organization proposed by the Physics Coordinator on the basis of his/her own opinion, and on the interest expressed by Members of the Collaboration. New PWGs may be created at any time by the PC, in consultation with the Spokesperson, following documented proposals by Members of the Collaboration.

The Physics Board takes decisions on performance of simulations, data analysis, conception and writing of papers. The Physics Board can formulate proposals to the MB and to the TB for the optimization of physics performances and the definition of running conditions.

The activities of the PB and PWGs are presented in regular 'Physics Forums' open to all Members of the Collaboration.

The work and the decisions of the PB are recorded in minutes, which are made available to the Collaboration.

Offline Board

The Offline Board (OB) is responsible for the development of the Offline of the experiment and for the co-ordination among the offline software of the various sub-detectors, the Data Acquisition (DAQ), project and the global ALICE offline framework. The OB is chaired by the Offline Coordinator (OC) and has the following membership:

- up to two representatives from each Subproject;
- one representative from the Physics Board;
- one representative from the Technical Board;
- authors of major software packages.

Ex-officio members of the OB are the Coordinators responsible for reconstruction, simulation, framework development and production environment. Representatives from the candidate Regional Centres are also members of the OB. The representatives of the Subprojects are nominated by the Subproject Leaders normally for three years.

The OB holds both open and closed meetings.

Editorial Board

The Editorial Board (EB) is responsible for the refereeing and subsequent approval of relevant ALICE publications concerning both physics and technical aspects of the experiment including contributions to proceedings and ALICE internal notes. Its task is to guarantee an efficient procedure and an effective internal quality assurance for ALICE publications.

The EB is chaired by a Member of the ALICE Collaboration, endorsed by the CB, upon nomination by the Spokesperson after consultation with the MB. The maximum duration of a term in office is three years, not renewable. In consultation with the Spokesperson the EB Chair may propose a deputy to the Management Board for confirmation.

EB Members are identified among active and recognized scientists of the Collaboration, and are nominated by the EB Chairperson after consultation with the MB and are endorsed by the CB. EB Members are appointed for two years, renewable once. Ex-officio Members of the EB are the Spokesperson, the Physics Coordinator or Deputy, one Deputy Spokesperson, and one CB Deputy Chairperson.

The EB:

- drafts the publication rules and procedures for discussion in CB and MB, and for approval by CB;
- organizes the refereeing and subsequent selection of all publications and contributions to proceedings, and of all internal notes and reports, prior to submission;
- organizes the bookkeeping and the archiving of all publications, contributions to proceedings, internal notes, PhD theses, and other relevant reports concerning the Collaboration.

The views, proposals and decisions of the EB are regularly reported to the CB and the MB.

Conference Committee

The Conference Committee (CC) coordinates the call for, and the selection of ALICE speakers for oral presentations in Conferences. It has the task to guarantee an efficient procedure and an effective internal quality assurance concerning ALICE conference representation.

The CC is chaired by a Member of the Collaboration, endorsed by the CB, upon nomination by the Spokesperson after consultation with the MB. The maximum duration of a term in office is three years, not renewable. In consultation with the Spokesperson the CC Chair may propose a deputy to the Management Board for confirmation.

CC Members are identified among active and recognized scientists of the Collaboration and are nominated by the CC Chairperson after consultation with the MB and endorsed by the CB. CC Members are appointed for two years, renewable once. Ex-officio Members of the CC are the Spokesperson, the Physics Coordinator, one Deputy Spokesperson, and the EB Chairperson.

The CC:

- drafts the selection rules and procedures for discussion in CB and MB, and for approval by CB;
- calls for and proposes to the MB and CB speakers to Conferences;
- reviews important talks prior to presentation.

The views, proposals and decisions of the CC are regularly reported to the CB and the MB.

IV - Management Functions

General Rules

- All mandates and appointments are valid for a limited period of time as defined by the Collaboration Board (CB)
 - More than one function may be held simultaneously unless the CB considers that there is a conflict of interest.
 - All post holders may be re-elected as specified by the organization rules.
-

Spokesperson and Deputy

The ALICE Collaboration has one Spokesperson. The Spokesperson is responsible for the execution of the ALICE project and reports to the CB. The Spokesperson represents the Collaboration to CERN Committees, to CERN Management, and to the outside world.

The Spokesperson must be resident at CERN during her/his mandate. The spokesperson is elected by the CB. The duration of the mandate is 3 years, not renewable.

The Spokesperson can nominate one or two Deputies, for endorsement by the CB. The mandate of the Deputy(ies) may not exceed the end of the mandate of the Spokesperson.

The Spokesperson shall not represent any country, institution, or activity within ALICE.

Coordinators

The Spokesperson, in consultation with the MB, nominates for endorsement by the CB the Technical Coordinator, the Resources Coordinator, the Physics Coordinator (in consultation with the physics PWG Convenors), the Offline Coordinator, the Trigger Coordinator, the Run Coordinator, and the Upgrade Coordinator.

Technical Coordinator and Resources Coordination need to be confirmed with the CERN Management.

The Coordinators act in consultation with and report to the Spokesperson and to the Management Board. During their term of office, the Coordinators must be based at CERN. They shall not represent any country, institution or activity within ALICE.

Technical Coordinator

The Technical Coordinator coordinates the activities required for the effective operation of the ALICE detector. The Technical Coordinator (TC) in particular:

- co-ordinates and monitors the operation of the detector, provides technical assessment of upgrade proposals, as well as monitors design and construction of corresponding detectors;
- proposes corrective actions if necessary;
- co-ordinates ALICE-wide common technical issues and activities, including test beam and detector calibration (software calibrations are handled by the Offline and PWG PP groups);
- is responsible for the execution of Infrastructure Common Projects and the preparation of the ALICE Infrastructure;
- is responsible for the Integration;
- co-ordinates the installation and the maintenance of the ALICE detector.

The duration of the mandate is 3 years, renewable.

The TC monitors, on behalf of the Collaboration, on a regular basis the technical progress of the different Projects and Subprojects through technical reviews, test results and site visits.

The TC chooses in consultation with the Spokesperson a Deputy Technical Coordinator (DTC). The TC chairs the Technical Board and presents the work, views and proposals of the TB to the MB.

The TC is ex-officio member of the Collaboration Board, Management Board and the Finance Board.

Resources Coordinator

The Resources Coordinator is responsible for the management of the common resources of the Collaboration, the Maintenance and Operation category A budgets, and the common resources for upgrade.

The duration of the mandate is 3 years, renewable.

The Resources Coordinator interacts with the RRB Scrutiny group for the scrutiny process of M&O-A and M&O-B budgets and expenses. The Resources Coordinator reports to the RRB bi-annual meetings.

The Resources Coordinator chairs the Finance Board and is ex-officio member of the Collaboration Board, Management Board and the Technical Board.

The Resources Coordinator maintains all official records of the Collaboration (MoUs and its addendum, memberships and nominations) and oversees the content of the Collaboration database.

The Resources Coordinator reports to the MB and CB.

Physics Coordinator

The Physics Coordinator (PC) coordinates the activities of the physics working groups towards analysis of ALICE data and the development of ALICE publications. He/She makes proposals to the MB for the execution of the experiment.

The duration of the mandate is 3 years, not renewable.

The Physics Coordinator nominates in consultation with the Spokesperson one or two Deputies for endorsement by the MB and the CB. The mandate of the deputy(ies) may not exceed the end of the mandate of the Physics Coordinator.

The Physics Coordinator chairs the Physics Board and presents the work, views and proposals of the PB to the MB.

The Physics Coordinator is ex-officio member of the CB, MB, CC and EB.

Offline Coordinator

The Offline Coordinator (OC) co-ordinates the Offline activities required to design the ALICE detector and analyse the data produced by it. In particular, the OC:

- is responsible for the design and implementation of the Offline framework, including simulation, reconstruction, analysis software and the distributed computing model;
- is responsible for the planning of the offline activities.

The duration of the mandate is 3 years, renewable.

The OC monitors, on behalf of the Collaboration, on a regular basis, the progress of the Offline of the different detectors. This monitoring work is carried out in collaboration with the responsible persons of the Offline of the concerned detectors.

The OC is ex-officio member of the Collaboration Board and represents the Offline Project in the Management Board.

Trigger Coordinator

The Trigger Coordinator is responsible for developing, validating, implementing and monitoring the ALICE Experiment Triggers. The duration of the mandate is one year renewable.

The Trigger Coordinator chairs the weekly Trigger meeting and reports to the TB and the PB, for major decisions he/she reports to the MB.

Run Coordination

The Run Coordinator together with the Deputy Run Coordinator, hereafter referred to as Run Coordination (RC), has the responsibility of organizing the day-to-day operation of the experiment. The responsibility of the RC includes: organization of the shifts, continuous monitoring of the detector data taking and interface with the Accelerators. The duration of the mandates of both the Run Coordinator as well as the Deputy Run Coordinator is one year, not renewable. RC will name, in consultation with the Spokesperson, Run Managers (RM) covering the whole year of data taking, and will rely on the support of a System Run Coordinator for each of the ALICE systems and subsystems.

It is the responsibility of the (sub)project leader to nominate the SRC and to ensure an efficient and reliable interface with RC.

Upgrade Coordinator

The duration of the mandate is 3 years, not renewable. The Upgrade Coordinator shall organize the activities of the groups proposing new detectors or major modifications to existing ones until approval of projects by the Collaboration Board. He/She shall call and chair forums and workshops to stimulate and steer the detailed discussion of the new projects and help in the assessment of their Physics case and adequacy of the technical solutions and resources. The UC will regularly report to the MB and CB on the progress of the proposals. When the UC will consider the projects ready for an evaluation by the MB and CB, he/she will organize the discussion leading to the final CB decision on the projects themselves. Once approved by the CB, the upgrade projects become part of the ALICE structure and are represented and discussed in the TB.

Other Coordinators

Other Coordinators may be appointed by the Spokesperson in consultation with the Management Board.

Project Leaders

The Project Leader (PL) of a Project or a Subproject is responsible for the execution of the Project respecting the physics priorities; this includes calibration if applicable, maintenance and performance monitoring, and potential changes and upgrades. The Project Leader manages the financial resources of the project (CORE, Upgrade and M&O-B budgets).

Project Leaders are nominated, in consultation with the Spokesperson, and by consensus of the institutes participating in the project. Project Leaders are proposed to the MB for endorsement.

Project Leaders report for ordinary operation to the Technical Board. For Resources management, Project leaders reports to the Resources Coordinator and for major issues to the Management Board.

ANNEX 1 – Duties of ALICE members

1. M&O A Payments

The sharing of the M&O-A budget is based on the number of “Scientists with PhD or equivalent qualifications” as specified in the Memorandum of Understanding for Maintenance and Operation of the ALICE Detector (CERN-RRB-2002-034). The list of PhD authors qualified to sign ALICE scientific publications is the same as the list of scientists established each year for the sharing of M&O- A budget. Non or late payment of M&O-A contributions will eventually result in the withdrawal of the right to sign scientific papers for the staff of the institutes concerned. Students are exempt from any withdrawal of the right to sign scientific papers. The ALICE Collaboration Board as well as the Resources Review Board (RRB), at their different meetings, are informed of any action taken with respect to late or non-payments of M&O-A contributions.

Procedure

September year n-1

The list of PhD scientists used for sharing the M&O-A budget is drawn up.
This list of named individuals also establishes the list of PhD authors for year n;
PhD Students are added to the list of authors.

October year n-1

The M&O-A budget and its sharing between the different F/A are approved by RRB.

January year n

M&O-A invoices are dispatched by CERN Finance Department. All invoices are due within 30 days.

September year n

If on 1st of September the outstanding amount is less than, or equal to, the current year’s contribution: CERN Finance Department sends a standard reminder to the F/A requesting payment within one month;

If on 1st of September the outstanding amount is larger than the current year’s contribution: ALICE Management sends a letter to the F/A announcing that, unless payment is made before the end of the year, the right to sign papers will be withdrawn as of December 31. Before the F/A receives a warning letter, the issue is discussed at the Fall Collaboration Board meeting.

December year n

If on 1st of December the outstanding amount is less than, or equal to, the current year’s contribution: ALICE Management sends a letter to the F/A requesting a payment plan for the outstanding invoice. If the MB accepts the payment plan, it replaces the outstanding invoice. If on 31st of December the outstanding amount is larger than the current year’s contribution: the right to sign papers is withdrawn as of the beginning of year n+1.

2. Contribution to Computing Resources

The Funding Agency will provide computing resources (CPU and disk) in a quantity greater than or equal to the fraction of the total resources required, minus the pledged CERN contribution, in proportion to its M&O-A contribution relative to the total ALICE M&O-A minus the CERN M&O-A. The minimal tape contribution required by a T1 is calculated from the fraction of the total tape requirements, minus the pledged CERN contribution. This total is divided in a similar manner to the other computing resources except that the M&O-A contribution of a Funding Agency is normalized to the sum of only the M&O-A contributions of all Funding Agencies, which are hosting a Tier1, again excluding CERN. The Computing Project, based on input from the Physics Coordination, will calculate yearly the total computing resources that are required. The Management Board then endorses this total before it is presented to the Computing Resources Scrutiny Group and the Computing Resource Review Board. The computing shares approved by the Computing RRB will then become the minimal resource requirements for each institution.

3. Shift and service work

Each year, shifts are worked out by the Run Coordination, discussed in the MB and allocated based on the M&O-A distribution.

Every institute member of ALICE has to contribute to service work for the Collaboration and it is the duty of team leaders to ensure that every PhD student provide six months equivalent of service work for the Collaboration before he/she can get a PhD thesis using the ALICE experiment.

The Technical Coordinator oversees the list and distribution of service tasks to ALICE members.

ANNEX 2 – ALICE Publication Policy

ALICE Policy for Publications and Presentations

The Conference Committee can be contacted at alice-cc@cern.ch .

The Editorial Board can be contacted at alice-editorial-board@cern.ch .

The Physics Board can be contacted at alice-mgt-physics-board@cern.ch .

1. Introduction

This document defines the rules for ALICE publications and presentations. It addresses the following topics:

- Physics analysis procedures
- ALICE official figures
- Conference presentations: selection of speakers, abstract submission, talk or poster preparation, and conference proceedings
- Procedures for physics publications
- Posting of published data
- Analysis Notes, ALICE Public Notes, Technical Public Notes, Technical Publications
- Student theses
- Authorship rules

2. Physics Analysis Procedures

All data from all parts of the ALICE detector are available to all members of the ALICE collaboration for analysis. The groups and institutions responsible for each subsystem must ensure that the necessary analysis tools, algorithms, codes, and correction parameters for that subsystem are available, documented and kept up-to-date.

All physics analyses in ALICE must comply with the ALICE computing rules approved by the Management Board:

(<http://aliweb.cern.ch/Offline/GeneralInformation/ComputingRules.html>)

Physics results presented in ALICE conference talks, conference proceedings, and publications, must be based on analysis carried out within an ALICE Physics Working Group (or Groups, in the case of overlapping topics). The analysis procedures and details of the evaluation of statistical errors and systematic uncertainties must be documented in an Analysis Note.

3. ALICE official figures

This section presents the definition, usage, and approval mechanisms of the various types of official ALICE figures:

- Simulation
- Performance
- Work in Progress
- Preliminary
- Published

All figures related to detector performance or physics results must be approved as official ALICE figures, following the procedures specified in this section, before they can be shown outside the Collaboration.

Each candidate for an official figure must be approved by the relevant PWG or Project Group. If identification of the relevant group is not clear, the Physics Coordination chooses the PWG that is best suited for discussing the figure.

3.1 Bookkeeping of figures

- Each PWG and Project Group, in consultation with the EB, maintains an ALICE Repository of Figures accessible via a web interface, containing located at <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Figure/>.
- The Repository contains Simulation, Performance, Preliminary, and Published figures.
- Each figure entry in the Repository of figures specifies a Contact Person and is accompanied by a complete caption.
- Each figure must include the following:
 - 1) Clearly labelled variables and units of measure
 - 2) A legend specifying the colliding systems and energy and the nature of the uncertainties (statistical and systematic).
 - 3) Published figures must explicitly include the label "ALICE".
- Each unpublished figure will specify its category (Simulation, Performance, Work in Progress, Preliminary).
- Only the most recent version of each Performance plot will be available in the Repository.

The following paragraphs define the various categories of official figure, their usage and their bookkeeping. Identical rules apply for results that are reported as numerical values.

3.2 ALICE Simulation figures

ALICE Simulation figures contain results of simulations of physics events and/or detector response, for example to illustrate expected performance of the detector, the size of corrections for detector effects, or reference distributions from event generators. Simulation figures must be accompanied by all relevant information to reproduce the figure, including version numbers of the software used, generator settings and a precise description of how the quantities in the figure were calculated from the simulation. This information is stored together with the figure in the Repository of figures. Each ALICE Simulation figure has a unique identification number and must be labelled 'ALICE Simulation'.

ALICE Simulation figures are discussed in the relevant PAG or PWG and approved by the PWG conveners or Project Leaders in consultation with the PAG coordinators.

3.3 ALICE Preliminary figures

ALICE Preliminary figures are intended for presentation at international conferences and workshops.

There are three subcategories of ALICE Preliminary figures:

- 1) Physics Preliminary figures show the results of analysis and must include estimates of all statistical and systematic uncertainties in the underlying analysis that are relevant for the interpretation of the measurement and the understanding of underlying physics. There will be only one version of each preliminary result. Numerical values of preliminary results may be given to persons who are not member of the ALICE collaboration on request. Such requests are handled by Physics Coordination. Preliminary results are superseded by the published version of the results.
- 2) Technical Preliminary figures provide supporting information about the analysis. Technical Preliminary figures are for example used to illustrate intermediate steps in the analysis or to compare different analysis methods for the same physical quantity. Technical Preliminary figures may show results that are not corrected for detector effects or results without systematic uncertainties. For Technical Preliminary figures, numerical values are not available to people outside the Collaboration.
- 3) Derived Preliminary figures contain reported results from a Physics (or Technical) Preliminary figures, for example to compare to a (new) model prediction, to an existing result of a different ALICE measurement, or to results of other experiments.

Each ALICE Technical or Physics Preliminary figure must be presented at the Physics Forum and be approved by the PWG conveners and Physics Board before it can be shown outside the Collaboration. Technical Preliminary figures may subsequently be updated (for example with a larger data sample) after approval by the PWG conveners and Physics Board. ALICE Physics and Technical Preliminary figures must be accompanied by an Analysis Note, which contains all relevant information about how the figures were obtained, including the software version(s), the data set(s), selections that were used, analysis algorithms and a description of the calculation of all uncertainties. The Analysis Note is reviewed by an Analysis Review Committee which is appointed by the PWG conveners in consultation with the PAG coordinators. The Analysis Note is made available to the collaboration before the results are presented at the Physics Forum.

Derived Preliminary figures are presented at a Physics Forum and can only be shown outside the collaboration after approval by the PWG conveners and the Physics Board.

Each ALICE Preliminary figure has a unique identification number, must be labeled "ALICE Preliminary" and is stored in the Repository of figures.

An ALICE Preliminary figure may be withdrawn in the case that an error is found in the analysis that invalidates the physics message of the figure. Such cases have to be brought to the attention of the Physics Board by the PWG conveners after which the figure will be withdrawn from the Repository of figures. An Analysis Note must be prepared to document the error and the withdrawal of the figure. In this case the PB decides if the withdrawn Preliminary figure can be replaced by a corrected version or only by publishing the result. If an ALICE Public Note is published, a new corrected version containing the correct figure must be submitted for the approval of the EB.

If some of the preliminary figures updated by final analysis do not appear in the publication, for example because of a restriction on the article length, the corresponding updated figure should be made publicly available through a procedure that will be specified by the EB and PB.

3.4 ALICE Performance figures

ALICE Performance figures are used to illustrate aspects of detector performance, in a general context, independent of a specific analysis. Any figures that illustrate intermediate steps in an analysis are ALICE Preliminary figures (see Section 3.3).

ALICE Performance figures are intended to illustrate the quality of the calibration, the behavior of ALICE (sub-) detectors, the resolution for tracking or particle identification techniques, etc. Performance figures can be shown outside the collaboration after approval by the PWG conveners or Project Leaders of the relevant PWG/detector system. Performance Figures evolve with time, for instance with a new version resulting from a new data set. Any change of the figure requires explicit re-approval by the PWG conveners or Project Leaders.

Each ALICE Performance figure has a unique identification number and must be labeled 'ALICE Performance' and stored in the Repository of figures.

3.5 ALICE Work in Progress figures

ALICE Work in Progress figures are transient, intended only for progress reports to funding agencies, review committees, reports of students within ALICE institutes, and national physics society meetings. They cannot be used for general presentations such as conference talks and seminars, other than these exceptional cases.

ALICE Work in Progress figures illustrate the status of an analysis, in which some corrections may not yet have been applied and from which quantitative physics conclusions cannot be drawn.

Each usage of a Work in Progress figure must be explicitly approved by the relevant PWG Conveners or Project Leaders, Physics Coordination and the Conference Committee.

Work in Progress figures are not entered into the Repository of figures and do not receive any figure identification number from the EB.

ALICE Work in Progress figures should not be made publically accessible, e.g., the slides cannot be made accessible on a web page or in a meeting program.

3.6 Published figures

ALICE Published figures are all figures containing final results that appear in a publication or Public Note. Each ALICE Published figure has a unique number and is stored in the Repository of figures, with reference to the corresponding publication or Public Note. When a figure is published, the corresponding Preliminary figure(s) are removed from the Repository (or marked obsolete).

3.7 Conflicts and exemptions

Conflicts regarding content and presentation of figures will be resolved by the Spokesperson, in consultation with PB and EB chairs, PWG convener(s) and Project leader(s). Exemptions to the above general rules may only be granted by the Spokesperson, and only in exceptional circumstances.

4. ALICE Presentations: Conference talks and posters, seminars, and technical presentations

An ALICE Presentation is a talk or poster by an ALICE Collaborator, presented on behalf of the ALICE Collaboration. ALICE Collaborators should use good judgment in determining whether a presentation is being made on behalf of ALICE, and should contact the Conference Committee in case of doubt. While a sharp distinction can sometimes not be drawn between an ALICE and a non-ALICE presentation, there are several elements that clearly require designation of a presentation as being on behalf of ALICE, including:

- Invitation for seminar or conference talks to present ALICE results
- Submission of a contributed conference talk or poster to present ALICE results
- First public presentation of a Preliminary figure
- Significant discussion of Performance figures and their underlying analyses
- Discussion of ALICE technical issues

The following committees and individuals play a role in the review and the approval of a public presentation (abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings):

- The Presenter is the person wishing to give a public presentation (talk or poster) on behalf of the ALICE Collaboration. The Presenter is responsible to ensure that all appropriate steps are followed and that all approvals are obtained before showing or discussing publicly ALICE data outside the Collaboration.
- The Project Group(s) and/or the Physics Working Group(s) are the primary venues where the Presenter discusses the analysis results to be presented. The abstract, talk/poster, and proceedings must be circulated in the PWG for discussion prior to delivery or submission to the conference, according to timelines defined below.
- The Team leader (or a person delegated by the Team leader) ensures that all material: abstract, talk, poster, and proceedings, comply with rules defined by the CC at https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Documents/Conferences_and_Contributions
- Project leader(s) or PWG conveners are responsible for quality assurance of the material, and must approve the abstract, talk/poster, and proceedings for topical presentations prior to delivery or submission to the conference.
- The Conference Committee (CC) coordinates all aspects of ALICE Conference presentations, with the goal of equitable distribution of talks across the collaboration, effective quality assurance, and efficient procedures. The CC Chairperson acts on behalf of the CC, consulting and delegating to members of the CC as appropriate. The CC calls for conference speakers and selects speakers for oral presentations. The CC reviews abstracts, talks and posters to ensure high scientific quality, and must approve them before submission or presentation.
- The Editorial Board (EB) provides oversight and management of conference proceedings and any other related document. The EB reviews each conference proceedings and must approve it prior to submission.
- The Physics Board and Conference Committee organize public rehearsal sessions in order to review presentations for major conferences and major seminars.
- The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the conference presentation process.

The primary criteria of the CC for selecting speakers are high quality of presentation of ALICE results, and fair and equitable distribution of talks among individuals and groups who have contributed to a given analysis or project. The CC will act in consultation with PB, PWG Conveners or Project Leaders, and the Spokesperson. The CC will maintain prioritized lists of eligible speakers on various topics, as appropriate, and review and revise such lists on a regular basis. Higher priority will be given to young scientists who have not yet obtained stable employment.

The talk rehearsal plays a crucial role in the preparation of a seminar or conference talk. Its purpose is to ensure a high quality of presentation, and not to discuss the approval of figures. The approval of new Performance or Preliminary figures to be used in a talk should, in all but

exceptional cases, be obtained before the talk rehearsal, and slides containing figures that have not been approved prior to the rehearsal will not be approved. Exceptions to this rule may only be granted by the Physics Coordinator or Spokesperson.

There are four general categories of ALICE talks: (i) Invited conference and major seminar talks, (ii) Contributed conference talks and posters, (iii) Regular seminar talks, and (iv) Technical Project presentations.

The mechanisms for discussion and approval of each of these are:

4.1 Speakers and Abstracts for Invited Conference Talks and Major Seminars

- A Major Seminar is defined as a high profile talk to a broad audience at a specific institution. These may be known in different places as PH Seminar, Departmental Colloquium, Departmental Seminar, Invited Lecture, etc. The CC should be consulted in case of doubt whether a talk should be considered to be a Major Seminar.
- The CC is responsible for selecting the ALICE speaker for an invited Conference Talk or Major Seminar. An invitation to an individual to give an Invited Conference Talk or Major Seminar on ALICE Physics is considered to be an invitation to the ALICE Collaboration and should be transferred to the CC, which will determine the appropriate speaker.
- The CC chairperson will be the point of contact between the Collaboration and each Conference organizing committee. The CC receives the conference invitation and corresponds with the conference organizing committee regarding the nature and scope of the talk.
- The CC will maintain an up-to-date list of all conference and major seminar invitations received and nominations made.
- The speaker nominated by the CC is responsible for composing and submitting the abstract, and for ensuring that all approvals for the abstract, talk and proceedings are obtained in a timely fashion.
- Approval of the abstract is the responsibility of the CC. The abstract must be circulated to the Collaboration for discussion at least 10 working days prior to the submission deadline of the conference. The CC will take the Collaboration discussion into account and approve the abstract for submission no less than three working days prior to the submission deadline of the conference.

4.2 Speakers and Abstracts for Contributed Conference Talks and Posters

- The ALICE PWGs will take a strategic approach to ALICE contributed conference presentations. The Conveners will solicit abstracts from the PWGs, to be considered as contributed talks and posters for a given conference. As part of this process, the PWG will identify analyses and physics topics appropriate to a given conference, and the Conveners will work with the members of the PWG to ensure contributed abstracts in these areas.
- Any member of ALICE may propose an abstract for consideration by the PWGs as a contributed talk or poster.
- An abstract may have only one author, who will be the Presenter. Two PhD students or a postdoc and a PhD student can be both authors of a poster.
- The PWG Conveners will identify cases of multiple abstracts on the same or largely overlapping topics. Such conflicts will be resolved by the CC and PWG Conveners, and not delegated to the conference organizers by submitting multiple overlapping abstracts. The CC Chair will have final say in case of conflict.
- The abstract is distributed for discussion within the Physics Working Group(s). While consensus and approval may in some cases be immediate, in other cases the content may require discussion and multiple abstracts may require coordination. Distribution to the PWG or Project must therefore be made at least 10 working days prior to the abstract submission deadline of the conference.

- After discussion in the PWG, the PWG Conveners approve the abstract and send it to the CC. Submission of the abstract to the CC must occur at least five working days before the abstract deadline of the conference.
- The CC reviews the abstract, in consultation with the PWG Conveners and the Spokesperson.
- Upon approval by the CC, the abstract is submitted to the Conference by the Presenter or a person in charge “for the ALICE Collaboration.”

4.3 Preparation of Presentations for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks, Major Seminars and Posters

- In general, new Preliminary Results are first reported at Conferences and not seminars. Presentation of new Preliminary results at a Major Seminar requires approval of the Spokesperson.
- Only approved ALICE figures may be shown.
Refer to Section 3 for the definition of each type of figure and its intended use. It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that appropriate approval has been obtained for all figures.
- A draft of the talk slides should be uploaded to the Talks Repository (located at https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Documents/Conferences_and_Contributions) for Collaboration discussion at least 10 working days prior to the seminar or start of conference.
- Talks of a broad nature will be uploaded to the “General Talks” section of the Talks Repository. The CC will review all Collaboration discussion and approve the talk at least three working days prior to the seminar or start of conference.
- Talks of a topical nature will be uploaded to the section of the Talks Repository of the appropriate PWG. The PWG conveners will review all Collaboration discussion and approve the talk at least (5) working days prior to the seminar or start of conference. The CC will then review the process and approve the talk at least three working days prior to the seminar or start of conference.
- The CC will determine whether the figures are appropriate for the occasion.
- Upon approval by the CC, which requires a rehearsal as described below, the presentation is posted on the ALICE Conferences web page as the “As Approved” version. Only cosmetic changes can be made after this point, and no changes may be made to the approved figures. The final version should be uploaded as the “As Given” version.
- Conference presentations including results of several experiments are approved by the ALICE CC in agreement with the CC (or their equivalents) of all other involved collaborations.
- Poster review is carried out according to the procedure of contributed presentations.

4.4 Rehearsals for Invited and Contributed Conference Talks and Major Seminars

CC approval of each talk requires a rehearsal. For major conferences, a special rehearsal mechanism may be put in place. In all other cases, the rehearsal procedures are organized by the CC as follows:

- The Presenter will rehearse the talk during the 10-day review period, prior to CC approval.
- Rehearsal of a general talk requires a member of the CC, CB, EB or PB to be present, who will recommend modifications or approval to the CC.
- Rehearsal of topical talks will be carried out by the appropriate PWG. The PWG Conveners will recommend modifications or approval to the CC.

- Only approved figures may be used.

4.5 Conference Proceedings

- A Conference Proceeding is the write-up of a presentation at a conference.
- It is the responsibility of the Presenter to ensure that the necessary approvals are obtained in a timely fashion.
- For topical presentations, the Proceedings draft is distributed by the Presenter, after approval by his/her Team leader, for discussion within the appropriate Physics Working Group at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. After discussion, the PWG Conveners review the Proceedings draft and, upon approval, send it to the EB for review and approval. Submission of the proceedings to the EB must occur at least 5 working days prior to the conference deadline.
- For general presentations, the Proceedings draft is made available for the Collaboration on the ALICE web site at least 15 working days prior to the conference deadline. The EB reviews the Proceedings draft. The EB may delegate the review of proceedings to other ALICE Collaborators, as appropriate.
- Upon approval by the EB, the Presenter submits the Proceedings to the Conference and may post it on the arXiv.
- Conference Proceedings including results of several experiments are approved by the ALICE EB in agreement with the EB (or their equivalents) of all other involved collaborations.

4.6 Regular Seminar Presentation

- Regular Seminar Presentations are talks for Group Seminars and limited groups of experts in the field at a specific institution, etc.
- The CC should be informed of invitations for Regular Seminars.
- The talk should be rehearsed in front of a member of the Collaboration Board, who is responsible for its content and who must ensure that only approved ALICE figures are shown.
- The Presenter is encouraged to send the talk to the CC after its presentation, for posting in the Talks Repository.

4.7 Project Technical Presentations

- Project Technical Presentations are conference talks and seminars of a technical nature, presenting results from an ALICE Project.
- Project Technical Presentations may be made either on behalf of the entire ALICE Collaboration or of a subset of ALICE working on a specific project. The procedures in this section apply in both cases.
 - Such talks may arise due to an invitation from a conference, contribution of talk to a conference, or invitation for a seminar.
 - The Project leader is responsible for choosing the speaker, approving the abstract, and carrying out the rehearsal.
 - The CC should be notified about the presentation. The Project leader and the CC determine the authorship of the contribution.
 - The CC should receive a copy of the slides at least five days prior to the talk for approval.
 - The final as-given slides should be sent to the CC for posting in the Talks Repository.
 - A Conference Proceedings for a Project Technical Presentation should be sent to the EB for approval at least five working days before the Conference deadline.

- For some Technical Presentations proceedings are requested by the organizer before the conference and are reviewed by the CC in agreement with the EB chair.

5. Procedures for Physics Publications

The following committees and individuals play a role in the preparation of each Physics Publication:

- The Paper Committee (PC) can only be formed when the analysis results fulfil at least the criteria for being approved as preliminary; i.e., the results have been presented and approved at the Physics Forum, the corresponding Analysis Note has been approved by the PWG convener. The content of the paper should be defined.
The PC is headed by the PC chair, who is responsible for the editing and assembling of material. The PC may be composed of further members e.g. having carried out the analysis. A large PC (more than 4 persons) may be formed in case of long papers and complex analyses. The PC is appointed by the PWG convener and approved by the PB. The PC is responsible for all steps from the first draft until the final publication.
- The Internal Referee Committee (IRC) is appointed by the EB.
One member of the IRC is appointed to be the IRC Chair, serving as the primary contact person for the IRC and managing the IRC activities. The IRC comprises experts and non-experts on the topic of the manuscript, drawn from across the Collaboration. The IRC carries out a comprehensive review of the physics analysis, accompanying documentation, and the text of the initial manuscript, as well as revisions to the manuscript and responses to comments from the Collaboration and the journal referee at subsequent stages of the publication process. The EB defines the charge of each IRC, and may include special tasks and requests in certain cases.
- The Editorial Board (EB) provides oversight and management of the publication process, ensuring that ALICE Publication Procedures are followed. The EB Chair acts on behalf of the EB, consulting the members of the EB as appropriate.
The EB organizes regular meetings to discuss the status of all papers in preparation, under reviews and submitted. The PWG conveners, the Physics Board coordinator and the Spokesperson participate in the meeting.
- The Physics Board (PB) provides oversight and review of the physics content of the manuscript.
- The Spokesperson is the final arbiter of all disputes arising at any stage of the publication process.

Preparation of a Physics Publication occurs in several distinct steps, with a recommended time schedule.

(Paper Flow scheme is presented at <http://aliceinfo.cern.ch/ArtSubmission/>)

5.1 Initial preparation of manuscript and supporting documentation

- Once an analysis is sufficiently advanced, an Analysis Note is prepared and presented to the PWG. This note contains all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis. A contact person is appointed by the PWG conveners for each Analysis Note. Analysis Notes are internal and signed by a subgroup of the collaboration, essentially all those who have contributed to the analysis. Authorship is decided by the PWG conveners.
- The PWG conveners and PAG coordinators should in principle appoint Analysis Review Committees (ARC) whose task is to follow the analysis progress and the preparation of the Analysis Note critically and provide support and feedback to the people carrying out the analysis. An ARC member is expected to give a statement when the results are presented at the Physics Forum.

- The PWG conveners may propose an ALICE Public Note containing preliminary results to be approved. A contact person is appointed by the PWG conveners for each Note. The ALICE Public Note can result from merging of several Analysis Notes and is signed by the Collaboration. The names of the authors of the Note are documented and visible within the collaboration. The PWG conveners appoint an internal committee reviewing the Note (NC). The NC is usually composed of members of the PWG and a person from a different PWG to give feedback from an external member. The results of the ALICE Public Note are presented and approved at the Physics Forum. Before the results are publicly shown, the Note has to be approved by the EB. The Note is made publicly available on CDS at the time when the results are publicly shown.

In case a result is not foreseen for preliminary status and is directly prepared for a publication, the ALICE Public Note can be similar (identical) to the paper draft.

The conveners should encourage the members of the PWG to provide ALICE Public Notes.

- The PWG conveners determine if a physics analysis is ready for consideration as a paper; i.e. the content of the paper is defined, the Analysis Note is approved and, if prepared, the corresponding ALICE Public Note is approved.

The PWG conveners recommend the paper for the presentation at the Physics Forum and for the PB approval.

- Upon the PB approval the PWG conveners appoint the PC to prepare the initial manuscript and to create a dedicated page on the ALICE publication web site. The PB may require at this stage revisions or the merging of several ongoing analyses into a single paper.
- The PB recommends to the EB that an IRC be formed.
- The PB determines the target journal for the manuscript, in consultation with the PC and IRC.
- The EB announces the appointment of the IRC and the target journal on the web pages.
- The PB is responsible for ensuring that the software and data used for the analysis comply with the ALICE computing rules (<http://aliweb.cern.ch/Offline/General-Information/ComputingRules.html>).
- A maximum period of 3 months is set between the PB approval and the first round of the Collaboration review. Passing this time, the EB, in consultation with the PB and the PWG conveners, may make a decision to dissolve the PC and the IRC and to remove the paper from the ALICE publication web site.

The task of preparing the publication falls back to the PWG.

5.2 First Collaboration Review

- The IRC reviews the manuscript and supporting documentation, and recommends corrections and changes as necessary.
- Upon approval of the draft by the IRC, the EB verifies that the actions of the PC and IRC meet the required standards, and reviews the draft before approving it for circulation to the full collaboration.
- Upon EB approval (to be done usually within 3 working days), the EB circulates the draft to the full Collaboration for detailed comment for a minimum of 10 working days. All supporting material specifying additional analysis details must be made available to the collaboration at this stage.
- This is the main review period for the Collaboration, and it is expected that any remaining significant issues will be raised at this step.
- Up to 5 member institutes are specifically requested by the EB to comment in detail during the Collaboration review period.

5.3 Second Collaboration Review

- The PC prepares a new draft and a set of replies to the Collaboration comments.
- The IRC reviews the revised draft and responses to comments, and recommends relevant corrections and changes as necessary and appropriate.
- Upon approval by the IRC, the EB reviews the changes to the text and author list.

The PB is involved in case of major changes or open issues.

- Upon EB approval, the EB circulates the revised manuscript, including revisions to the author list that arose, to the full collaboration for comments for a minimum of 5 working days.
- The main purpose of this second comment period is for the Collaboration to verify that all points raised in the first comment period have been addressed, though on occasion a significant new issue may still be raised at this step.
- The PC prepares a new draft, in response to new comments received.
- The IRC reviews the changes, and upon acceptance recommends to the EB that the paper is ready for publication.
- The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and upon acceptance recommends to the Spokesperson that the paper is ready for publication.
- In parallel of the second collaboration review, the EB submits the paper draft for CERN review. CERN comments and approval are expected within 1 week.

5.4 Submission to journal and response to referees

- Upon approval by the Spokesperson, the final manuscript is submitted by the EB chair or a person in charge to the journal and arXiv.
- The response from the journal is made available to the Collaboration via the corresponding website.
- The PC prepares a revised manuscript and a response to the referee's comments.
- The IRC reviews the modified manuscript and response to the referee's comments, and recommends corrections and changes as necessary.
- Upon approval by the IRC, the EB reviews the changes to the text and the responses to the referee's comments.
- In case of major changes, the EB, in consultation with the PB, sends the revised manuscript and responses to the referees to the collaboration with a deadline for comments of 5 working days. The PC prepares a new draft, in response to comments received from the Collaboration at this step.

In case of small changes, the revised version can be resubmitted immediately after the EB approval.

- The IRC reviews the changes, and upon acceptance recommends to the EB that the paper is ready for resubmission.
- The EB carries out a final review of all comments and revisions, and upon acceptance recommends to the Spokesperson that the paper is ready for resubmission.
- Upon approval by the Spokesperson, the EB chair or a person in charge resubmits the manuscript to the journal and posts the revised version on arXiv.

5.5 Final steps

Upon submission to arXiv the paper is made publicly available on the CERN Document Server and on the ALICE web site.

If the paper is rejected by the journal or changes requested by the journal are deemed unacceptable to the Collaboration, appeal or resubmission to a different journal will be

considered and formulated by the Spokesperson, the EB chair and the PB coordination, in consultation with the PC, IRC, PB, and EB.

5.6 Exceptions

Procedures deviating from the above can be approved by the MB for individual papers in order to speed up the publication process in exceptional circumstances. Such exceptions are communicated to the PB.

6. Posting of Published Data

All figures and data from every ALICE physics publication will be made publicly available on the ALICE web site. Each paper will have a web page that includes links to:

- All figures in the paper, in formats suitable for inclusion in both presentations and documents. Every figure should make clear which results are ALICE results. Tabulation of all data points in every figure will be presented on the web page, including separately each type of error and uncertainty. Uncorrelated uncertainties will be associated with the data points, while correlated uncertainties will be tabulated separately. Data will be tabulated in formats suitable both for visual inspection and for downloading for external use. In general, these data are stored on HEP data, submitted by the PC chair or a person in charge.
- Tabulation of additional data reported in the paper, if any, that do not appear in the figures.

7. Other types of publications and notes

7.1 Analysis Notes

Analysis Notes contain all information needed for the reproduction of the analysis.

They are intended to communicate information to the collaboration and document it for future reference. Analysis Notes are signed by a subgroup of the collaboration and are approved by the PWG conveners.

Analysis Notes are not publicly available and may not be distributed outside the Collaboration. They are accessible to all members of the Collaboration on the ALICE web site https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_analysis_note.

7.2 ALICE Public Notes

ALICE Public Notes accompany preliminary results and publications. They contain supporting material, additional and complementary figures and explanation of the methodology used in the analysis.

ALICE Public Notes can result from merging of several Analysis Notes.

ALICE Public Notes are authored by the ALICE Collaboration. The names of the authors of the analysis are documented and visible within the collaboration on the link:

https://aliceinfo.cern.ch/Notes/Documents/Review/reviewitems_public_note

The EB circulates the Public Note to the collaboration for at least 5 working days and designates at least one member institute to comment in detail.

Upon EB approval, the ALICE Public Note is publicly available on CERN Document Server:

<http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE%20Public%20Notes?ln=de>.

7.3 Technical Public Notes

ALICE Technical Note contains technical information about the ALICE detector and its performances, including both hardware and software.

The authorship of the Note shall be defined by the appropriate Project leader.

The Project leader circulates the Note among all members of the Project for comments and approves it for submission to the EB.

If a Technical Note is authored by the whole collaboration the EB circulates the draft to the collaboration for comments for at least 5 working days.

Upon EB approval, the Note is publicly available on CERN Document Server: <http://cds.cern.ch/collection/ALICE%20Public%20Notes?ln=de>.

7.4 Technical Publications

The purpose of an ALICE Technical Publication is to communicate technical information about the ALICE detector and its performance, including both hardware and software, to the Scientific Community. The authorship of these papers shall be defined by the appropriate Project leader.

The Project leader circulates the draft among all members of the Project for comment, and approves it for submission to the EB, along with a recommendation for the journal. The EB referees the draft and either returns it to the Project leader with comments or approves it for publication.

The EB chair or a person in charge submits the manuscript to the journal and post it on the arXiv. Response from the journal and referee reports will be circulated among all members of the Project for comment, and resubmission will follow the same procedure as the initial submission.

7.5 Usage of ALICE data and methods in non-ALICE publications

Members of the ALICE Collaboration may be authors of review papers and papers on general methods, etc.

ALICE physics and technical data that have not been published by the ALICE Collaboration, in conference proceedings or refereed journal, may not be included in non-ALICE publications.

ALICE physics and technical data that are presented in a student thesis but not in conference proceedings or in a refereed journal may not be included in non-ALICE publications.

8. Student theses

The Editorial Board maintains a list of ALICE students and their thesis topics. This list can be used by the Conference Committee, Physics Board and Physics Working Groups, to track student activity and promote student involvement in conferences. It is the responsibility of the PWG conveners, and Project Leaders, together with the thesis advisors, to keep this list up to date.

Data and analyses presented in a student thesis but not in ALICE Conference Proceedings or in ALICE refereed publication are not considered to be published ALICE results. Results obtained by the student must be labelled "this thesis". The text must be clear in order to prevent such results being taken from a publicly available thesis and considered erroneously as results of the ALICE Collaboration.

All student theses presenting ALICE data must be made available to the collaboration upon acceptance of the thesis and uploaded to CDS. Thesis subjects are on GLANCE, thesis on

CDS. It is the responsibility of the thesis advisor and the PWG convener or Project leader to ensure an electronic copy of the thesis and that it is uploaded in a timely fashion.

9. Authorship

The Institute team leaders are responsible for supplying a list of names, in accordance with the ALICE document ALICE-INT-2006-005, in the corresponding data base GLANCE. This list contains the names of the authors, the institute to which they belong and the date of joining the ALICE collaboration. The Institute Team leader is also responsible for announcing the departure of people from the collaboration.

Qualifications to sign physics publications:

- 1) A person must be registered in the ALICE Collaboration Database with the following status: Physicist, Postdoc, Senior Engineer or PhD Student;
- 2) Physicists, Postdocs and Senior Engineers must be ALICE members for at least one year to be eligible for authorship rights; in addition they must count for the sharing of the budget for Maintenance and Operation Cat. A. If a postdoc was previously an ALICE student, his/her authorship starts immediately;
- 3) PhD students must be ALICE members for at least 6 months to be eligible for authorship rights; If a PhD student was previously an ALICE Master student, his/her authorship starts immediately;
- 4) PhD students must provide six months equivalent of service work for the Collaboration; Failure to do so in due time can lead to the suspension of signature rights;
- 5) The corresponding institute must be in good standing, as determined by the Collaboration Board and the Constitution (<http://aliweb.cern.ch/system/files/documents/ALICEOrgvs10.pdf>);
- 6) The qualification period stops when leaving ALICE: PhD students keep authorship rights for 6 months after their departure date. Physicists, Postdocs, Senior Engineers keep authorship rights for 12 months after their departure date;

Exceptions from this rule may be granted by the MB on suggestions from the EB chair in consultation with the EB and spokesperson.

Any author can remove his/her name from the author list in a particular case. Removal of a qualified author from the author list by the team leader requires a mutual agreement between the author to be removed and the team leader.

In the case of a change of affiliation within the collaboration the member stays affiliated with the institute that pays the M&O cost for the one additional year. Other procedures are possible with the agreement of all parties involved.