

# Minutes of the Extraordinary Collaboration Board Meeting 11 April 2022

Link to the agenda in Indico: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1145734/>

**Chairperson:** Silvia Masciocchi  
**Deputies:** Marielle Chartier, Ken Oyama  
**Secretary:** Siegfried Foertsch

**CB Members present via zoom: Note: information based on the indico registrations + zoom attendance ← please let us know if incorrect**

**Armenia - Yerevan:** S. Grigoryan  
**Austria - Vienna:** P. Buhler;  
**Azerbaijan - Baku/Daresbury (voting group):** A. Rustamov;  
**Brazil - Campinas/Sao Paulo/UFABC (cluster):** M. Munhoz<sup>§</sup>;  
**{Knoxville}/Porto Alegre (voting group):** M. B. Gay Ducati<sup>§</sup>;  
**Bulgaria - Sofia:** V. Kozhuharov  
**China - Beijing/Hefei (voting group):** Z. Tang;  
**Shanghai:** Q. Shou for Y. Ma;  
**CCNU Wuhan:** X. Zhang for Z. Yin;  
**Croatia - Split/University Politehnica of Bucharest (voting group):** **no one** for S. Gotovac;  
**Zagreb:** **no one** for M. Planinic ;  
**Czech Republic - Prague-CTU:** G. Contreras Nuno;  
**{Athens}/Prague-IP (voting group):** P. Zavada;  
**Prague-NPI:** F. Krizek;  
**Denmark - Copenhagen:** J.-J. Gaardhoeje;  
**Finland - Helsinki/Jyvaskyla (cluster):** S. Räsänen;  
**France - Clermont-Ferrand:** P. Crochet;  
**Grenoble:** R. Guernane<sup>◇</sup>;  
**Lyon IPN:** B. Cheynis;  
**Nantes Subatech:** G. Batigne for M. Germain;  
**Orsay:** C. Hadjidakis;  
**Saclay:** A. Baldisseri;  
**Strasbourg:** C. Kuhn;  
**Germany - Bonn/Frankfurt-IFI (voting group):** B. Ketzer;  
**GSI:** R. Averbeck;  
**Frankfurt-FIAS:** V. Lindenstruth;  
**Frankfurt-IKE:** H. Appelshäuser;  
**Heidelberg:** J. Stachel;  
**Munich:** L. Fabbietti<sup>§</sup>;  
**Muenster:** A. Andronic;  
**Tuebingen/Worms (voting group):** **no one** for H. Schmidt;  
**Greece - Athens/Prague-IP (voting group):** P. Zavada<sup>\*\*\*</sup> ;  
**Hungary - Budapest:** G.G. Barnaföldi;  
**India - Aligarh:** **no one** for S. Ahmad;  
**Bhubaneswar/Mumbai (voting group):** **no one** for P. Sahu;  
**Bhubaneswar/Panjab/Konya University Turkey (voting group):** B. Mohanty;

Gauhati/Indore (voting group): R. Sahoo;  
Jammu: A. Bhasin;  
Kolkata-Bose: **no one** for S. Raha;  
Kolkata-Saha: **no one** for Sukalyan Chattopadhyay;  
Kolkata-VECC: **no one** for Subhasis Chattopadhyay;  
**Indonesia - LIPI**: **no one** for R. Sadikin (w/o vote);  
**Italy - Alessandria**: L. Ramello;  
Bari Uni+INFN: D. Elia for V. Manzari;  
[Bari Politecnico/ Foggia (cluster)] and [Rome Sapienza/Rome Sezione(cluster)] (voting group): A. Mastroserio;  
Bologna: P. Antonioli;  
Cagliari: C. Cicalo;  
Catania/Messina (cluster): A. Badalà\*\*\*;  
Frascati: A. Fantoni for V. Muccifora;  
Padova: A. Rossi;  
Pavia and Brescia: G. Bonomi;  
Salerno: D. De Gruttola for S. De Pasquale;  
Trieste: S. Piano;  
Turin/Turin Politecnico (cluster): M. Masera;  
**Japan - Hiroshima**: K. Shigaki;  
Nagasaki-IAS/Nara/Tokyo (voting group): K.Oyama for T. Fusayasu;  
Tokyo Univ./Nara Women's Univ (voting group): **no one** for M. Shimomura  
Tsukuba: T. Chujo;  
**Mexico - {Kansas}/Culiacan/[Mexico-Merida(cluster)]/Lima (voting group)**: D. Tapia Takaki<sup>◇\*\*</sup> for I. L. Monzon;  
Mexico City-ICN: G. Paic;  
Mexico City-UNAM: **no one** for A. Menchaca-Rocha;  
Puebla: A. Fernández Téllez;  
**Netherlands - NIKHEF/Utrecht (cluster)**: R.J.M. Snellings;  
**Norway - Bergen-Tonsberg (cluster)**: D. Roehrich;  
Bergen-BUC: D. Roehrich for H. Helstrup;  
Oslo: T.S. Tveter;  
**Pakistan - Islamabad**: **no one** for J.A. Butt;  
**Peru - Lima. {Kansas}/Culiacan/[Mexico-Merida(cluster)]/Lima (voting group)**: D. Tapia Takaki<sup>◇\*\*</sup>;  
**Poland - Cracow INP**: M. Kowalski;  
Cracow AGH: J. Kitowski;  
Warsaw-NCNS: T. Siemiarczuk;  
Warsaw-UT: L. Graczykowski;  
**Rep. of Korea - Chungbuk/Jeonbuk (voting group)**: **no one** for S.-Y. Noh;  
KISTI/[Gangneung/Seoul Konkuk (cluster)] (voting group): Y.W. Baek for S. Ahn;  
Inha: M. J. Kweon;  
Pusan: I.-K. Yoo;  
Seoul Sejong/Seoul Yonsei (voting group): **no one** for Y. Kwon;  
**Romania - Bucharest-ISS**: A. Dobrin;  
Bucharest-NIPNE: M. Petrovici;  
Bucharest-UPB/ Univ of Split (voting group): M. Carabas<sup>◇</sup>  
**Russia - Dubna**: A. Vodopyanov;  
Gatchina: Y. Ryabov;  
Moscow-INR: T. Karavicheva;  
Moscow-ITEP: A. Akindinov;  
Moscow-MEPHI: N. Kondratyeva;  
Moscow-Kurchatov: **no one** for V. Manko;  
Novosibirsk: **no one** for I. Pestov (w/o vote);  
Protvino/Moscow MIPT (cluster): S. Sadovskiy \*\*\*;

Saroy: **no one** for N. Zavyalov (w/o vote);  
St.Petersburg: G. Feofilov;  
**Slovakia - Bratislava**: B. Sitar;  
Kosice/Safarik/TU (cluster): I. Kralik;  
**South Africa - Cape Town/Somerset West/Johannesburg (cluster)**: T. Dietel;  
**Sweden - Lund**: D. Silvermyr<sup>◇</sup> for P. Christiansen;  
**Switzerland - CERN**: P. Vande Vyvre;  
**Thailand - Suranaree**: **no one** for C. Kobdaj (w/o vote);  
**Turkey - Bhubaneswar/Panjab/Konya (voting group)**: B. Mohanty<sup>\*\*\*</sup>;  
**Ukraine - {Austin/}Kiev (voting group)**: C. Markert<sup>\*\*</sup>;  
**United Kingdom - Birmingham**: D. Evans;  
{Azerbaijan}/Daresbury (voting group): A. Rustamov<sup>\*\*</sup>;  
Liverpool: J. Norman;  
**United States - Austin/Kiev (voting group)**: C. Markert<sup>\*\*</sup>;  
Berkeley/LBNL (cluster): S. Klein;  
Chicago/San Luis Obispo (voting group): E. Garcia-Solis;  
Ohio/Creighton (voting group): J. Seger;  
Wayne: S. Voloshin;  
Houston: L. Pinsky;  
Tennessee/Porto Allegre (voting group): M. B. Gay Ducati<sup>\*\*\*§</sup>;  
{Kansas}/Culiacan/[Mexico-Merida(cluster)]/Lima: D. Tapia Takaki<sup>\*\*\*◇</sup> ;  
Yale: J. Harris;  
ORNL: **no one** for C. Loizides.

\*\* Institute/Representative appears two times because the voting group extends over different countries

\*\*\* Representative of the voting group

§ Attended without registration in indico

◇ Registered in indico without attending

**Junior Representatives:** H. Bossi (Yale, USA), L. Quaglia (University of Torino INFN, I), C. Reetz (Ruprecht Karls Universität Heidelberg, DE)

#### **Ex-Officio:**

S. Masciocchi (Collaboration Board Chairperson)  
 M. Chartier, K. Oyama (Deputies Collaboration Board Chairperson)  
 L. Musa (Spokesperson)  
 B. Erasmus (Deputy Spokesperson)  
 M. Ploskon (Deputy Spokesperson)  
 F. Antinori, A. Fantoni, (Elected Members ad Personam of the Management Board)  
 A. Baldisseri, V. Barroso, S. Beolé, Y. Kharlov, S. Panebianco, W. Trzaska (Project Leaders)  
 W. Riegler<sup>§</sup> (Technical Board Chairperson)  
 A. Dainese (Physics Coordinator)  
 R. Arnaldi, D. Miskowiec (Conference Committee Chairpersons)  
 J. C. Castellanos and F. Prino<sup>◇</sup> (Editorial Board Chairpersons)  
 A. Morsch (Software, Physics Data Processing and Computing Coordinator)

K. Schweda (Service Work Board Chairperson)  
 S. Piano (Computing Resources Coordinator)  
 A. Telesca (Resources Coordinator)  
 J. Klein and M. van Leeuwen (Upgrade Coordinators)  
 ALICE Secretariat

University of Derby (UK): L. Barnby<sup>s</sup>  
S. Foertsch (Collaboration Board Secretary)

**Other participants:**

D. Adamova (CZ)  
N. Bastid (F)  
B. Batyunya (R )  
A.Bell Hechavarria (D)  
P. Braun Munzinger (D)  
I. Chakaberia (US)  
A.De Falco (I)  
N. De Marco (I)  
A. Jacholkowski (PL)  
A. Kisiel (PL)  
E. Lesser (US)  
A. Mastroserio (I)  
T. Nayak (IN)  
J. Otwinowski (PL)  
P. Pithioud (CH)  
V. Riabov (R)  
E. Scomparin (I)  
K. Safarik (CZ)  
A.Trifiro (I)

**Total 2022 voting rights (January 2022): 99**

**Quorum for convening the meeting (as Zoom meeting: 2/3 of the eligible voting members, including proxies): 66**

**Maximum number of votes of CB present (registered) on April 11, 2022: 86**

**2/3 of the eligible voting members: 66**

**2/3 of the total present votes: 58**

*Note by the editor: Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, this special CB meeting is held online via zoom. Voting is performed online using an indico registration format as*

*well as survey function prepared on a special indico page, linked to from the main meeting indico page.*

## **Words from the Chair**

Silvia Masciocchi welcomes everybody present who joined via zoom, thanks all the members for making themselves available for this important meeting in order to consult each other and find a way forward, in consultation with CERN council, during these challenging times. She goes on to thank Luciano Musa in particular for taking on the tremendous workload in this regard on behalf of the collaboration.

### **Administrative matters**

Since this meeting was held in zoom, consensus had to be reached on a number of administrative matters which included confirmation of attendance at this meeting, approval of the agenda of this meeting as well as the communication of the official results of the endorsements at this meeting via email after the meeting. An indico survey was conducted and the results are as follows:

#### Attendance

77/77 votes cast confirm attendance at this meeting

#### Agenda of this meeting

The agenda of the extraordinary CB meeting held on April 11, 2022 was uploaded on Indico. No comments on the agenda were received.

- In favor: 75
- Opposed: 1
- Abstained: 1

The agenda of the CB meeting held on April 11, 2022 is approved.

#### Announcing the results

It is proposed to communicate the results of the endorsements to the members via email by distributing only the numbers and not the single votes which, however, could be provided on individual demand.

- In favor: 73
- Opposed: 1
- Abstained: 3

Communicating the official results of the endorsements as the number of votes via email after the meeting exclusively to the CB members is endorsed. The results of the open votes would be made available upon request. As a matter of principle it is expected that these results are treated with the necessary discretion and are not meant for any further distribution.

## Items from the Spokesperson

Luciano Musa starts the presentation using slides uploaded on indico. The following three cases are presented which was followed by a discussion and a vote by the CB members with voting rights:

### **Proposal for LHC publications in period before June 16th/17th 2022 CERN Council**

**“CASE 1** - Work performed before 24th February

We define “work performed” as papers for which the analysis approvals took place before 24 February 2022.

*In ALICE, this corresponds to the date when the paper proposal was presented to the Physics Forum, which happens after the approval of the corresponding Analysis Note by the PWG conveners.*

For these papers we propose:

- The author list and institution list policy remain unchanged;
- The paper has added to it the text: “The results reported in this paper are based on work performed before the

24<sup>th</sup> of February 2022. In addition we propose that the author list of those papers that have already completed circulation be reopened. Any authors that wish to remove their names from any papers should inform the chair of the editorial board/publications committee by email during this period.”

**“CASE 2** - Work completed on or after 24<sup>th</sup> February

This class applies to papers where the work was completed on or after the 24th February 2022 and that are ready for submission before any guidance or rule changes issued from the June 16th/17th CERN Council have been interpreted or implemented.

For these papers we propose:

- The paper gives the name of the collaboration but at this stage has no author list or institution affiliation listed. It is added as a preliminary results public or conference note to CDS. This is a holding position to allow distribution of the scientific results.
- In addition, the paper can be submitted to the journal for review in this form. The author list and affiliation will need to be determined before final journal publication. A discussion will be held before final journal publication and after the June Council session. If the paper is accepted for publication before the June Council meeting a delay in publication will be requested.

For colleagues that need to demonstrate their contributions to these papers without author lists the spokesperson will issue letters confirming the contribution.”

**“CASE 2B** – Alternative proposal for all papers ready for submission

A decision regarding author list is postponed till June 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> CERN Council

For all papers ready for submission till June 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup>, irrespective of completion date, we propose:

- The paper gives the name of the collaboration but at this stage has no author list or institution affiliation listed. Two cases are being considered:
  - It is submitted as a preliminary results public or conference note to CDS;
  - It is submitted as a pre-print to CDS and arXiv.org.
- In addition, the paper can be submitted to the journal for review in this form. The author list and affiliation will need to be determined before final journal publication. A discussion will be held before final journal publication and after the June Council session. If the paper is accepted for publication before the June Council meeting a delay in publication will be requested.
- Immediately applicable to all papers in the pipeline
- Similar to Case 2, INSPIREHEP will not list individual authors, while papers are only on CDS or arXiv.org
- Other implementation details and consequences same as for Case 2”

Before opening the floor for discussion Silvia Masciocchi thanks all the members for their feedback and proposals in this complicated matter in order to continue scientific cooperation peacefully. In the ongoing process to find a way forward all inputs and proposals, also made at this meeting, will be considered in drafting the eventual resolution.

#### Discussion:

Jesus Guillermo Nuno Contreras brings up case 1 by explicitly stating the unlawful invasion of Ukraine by Russia.

Silvia Masciocchi comments that similar statements were received. At the same time she raises concerns that certain journals would not accept such wording.

Luciano Musa adds that groups of the Czech Republic and Poland are engaging in dedicated discussions regarding this topic with a corresponding disclaimer stating the invasion. Further meetings are needed to clarify the co-authorship of Russian collaborators as the treatment of the disclaimer by journals might be inconsistent.

Jesus Guillermo Nuno Contreras reiterates the need to express the bigger issue with such a statement.

Christina Markert comments that an approved footnote used by the journal could contain the essence of the resolution passed by the CERN Council.

Luciano Musa adds that a consensus on this matter is needed.

Marek Kowalski states that Polish institutes are supporting the disclaimer as well as the publication of ALICE papers without authors. Furthermore, all ALICE papers appearing after February 24, 2022 should be suspended until the CERN Council has reached a verdict.

Silvia Masciocchi questions the suspension of all papers as it will be detrimental to the productivity of the experiment.

Andrea Dainese questions case 2B which seems to be not consistent especially for preliminary results and would therefore require the decision by Council.

Luciano Musa clarifies that this case should be seen as an alternative option as papers are archived in any case.

Andrea Dainese favors case 2, especially in view of the students and young collaborators regarding their theses or talks.

Spencer Klein agrees with Marek Kowalski's proposal and goes on by arguing that the CERN Council is too slow in reaching consensus. He proposes to remove all Russian institutes.

Silvia Masciocchi states that such a proposal would be difficult to implement.

Luciano Musa reassures that CERN Council is not treating this matter as business as usual and instead is responding and reacting as required and that it has plans of action also with regards to legal aspects for this rather complex situation in place.

Lukasz Graczykowski emphasizes the official statement of the NCN, Polish funding agency of the LHC experiments, that any collaboration with Russian institutes should be suspended until the decision of the CERN Council.

Johanna Stachel advocates, as case 1 is essentially off the table, that all efforts should be on finalizing the authors list and that preprints of papers should be stored on archive in the interest of the students and young members of the collaboration.

Silvia Masciocchi echoes the concern that the author list should be finalized as soon as possible guided by the decision of the CERN Council.

Angela Badala queries the exact purpose of deciding on a proposal if more input is provided.

Luciano Musa states that the CB decides to adopt case 2B. He reiterates that it is important to move forward as the collaboration has a responsibility towards its young members.

Silvia Masciocchi adds that all four LHC experiments must, once they have the necessary support, act together in going forward. All the data of Run 2 analyzed before February 24, 2022 should be published.



Pietro Antonioli thanks both chairs for their leadership and for conducting these discussions in a respectful way especially in these difficult times. He doubts that case 1 should be abandoned and proposes to maintain a common approach. In support of case 2B he proposes to have a follow up meeting in June.

Luciano Musa reminds that the CB has all the rights to decide differently. Similar discussions are taking place amongst the other three experiments. At this stage case 1 is postponed indefinitely.

Karel Safarik appeals to be proactive as CB and not wait for Council to decide on principles. Deliberations by Council should be guided and influenced by the views and decisions of the respective CBs.

Silvia Masciocchi replies that it is not trivial to find the perfect solution and that guidance in this regard would be needed.

Luciano Musa adds that the CERN rules are the guarantee for the CBs of all the experiments to operate without constraints and that these function consistently. Furthermore these established rules are the key to credit the scientific output.

Karel Safarik reiterates that we as the CB should decide and construct the rules.

Luciano Musa warns against going our own way and that decisions have to be aligned with the overall consensus. The implication and outcome of the influence and decisions of the 23 member states has to be carried out by management.

Anton Andronic supports an author list in order to maintain, as far as possible, a paper in its completeness as uploaded on the repository.

Silvia Masciocchi agrees and adds that publications are borne out of respect within a scientific collaboration, also in support of the Ukrainian colleagues.

Alberto Baldisseri agrees with Luciano Musa that decisions need to be coherent amongst all four major experiments and that, in supporting case 2B, the author list gets finalized according to the decision of the Council.

Silvia Masciocchi continues by proposing, irrespective of the council meeting in June, to explore ways not to break off ties with those Russian scientists who are opposed to the war.

Johanna Stachel adds that the collaboration should participate in the decision making so that, once the war has stopped, the collaboration can continue unhindered and in the cleanest possible way.

Christina Markert finds that both parties mostly affected, i.e. the Ukrainian and Russian groups, should be given the opportunity to state their respective cases. She is in close contact with Victor Trubnikov and experiences the trust he has in the collaboration. She inquires about the Ukrainian community at CERN.

Luciano Musa is also in contact with the Ukrainian members in ALICE. The Ukrainian delegate joins regular CERN meetings as associate member. There is an existing support proposal program for Ukrainian teams as most have fled and many buildings are destroyed, especially the team of the University of Kharkiv.

Federico Antinori supports case 2B and at the same time urges for a meeting to address those Russian institutes that support the invasion. He expresses confidence that a solution will be found to honor the individual scientific input.

Guy Paic would like to know the dependence of the collaboration on the development of hard- and software by the Russian institutes.

Luciano Musa replies by stating that a document which addresses the consequences of a suspension of Russian institutes and its implications on the experiments and possible mitigations, is being drawn up to be submitted to the Council.

Jesus Guillermo Nuno Contreras repeats that CERN should not support Russian institutes who support the war.

Silvia Masciocchi reiterates that contact with all colleagues is paramount.

Yury Kharlov bases his support for case 1 on the obligations towards both students as well as members financed by the signed up institutes for work performed before February 24, 2022 to all appear as authors on publications. This would also apply to Run 3 as well as ALICE 3 for which the contractual obligations are still in effect.

Silvia Masciocchi notes this statement but appeals for understanding of the opposing opinions.

Peter Braun-Munzinger supports case 2B and proposes the use of an author list that is detached from institutions as these are prone to represent political statements. Hence, a change in the style and an apolitical approach in the conduct of the collaboration is propagated as soon as possible.

Luciano Musa adds that the Council is looking at a viable solution by continuing with those institutes who do not support the war. However, this is difficult to implement as most institutes are funded by one ministry. Hence, the addition of the disclaimer for work performed before February 24, 2022 is recommended.

Yury Kharlov supports this suggestion but not as a funding agency.

Silvia Masciocchi mentions finding alternative ways to collaborate.

Grigorii Feofilov expresses his gratitude towards the MB and CB in how this stressful and emotional time is handled and appeals to the sensitive spirit shown by CERN and also carried forward by ALICE. Despite the strong political and financial pressure the aim should be to support young scientists. Any sanctions will be to the detriment of scientists but not to the institutions and the ministry. For the most positive way forward the motive should be the future of the collaboration.

Massimo Masera finds case 2B acceptable since it would allow the recognition of the contributions by Russian collaborators before February 24, 2022. More work is needed ahead of the Council meeting to find a solution for handling the time before and after February 24, 2022.

Raymond Snellings prefers to have the list of Russian authors removed from the author list. Case 2B would not allow the individual and unsolicited removal of names from the author list. This measure should be implemented before the next Council meeting.

Silvia Masciocchi clarifies that under case 2B the preprints carry no author list. These only appear once the paper gets published.

Raymond Snellings appeals for the urgent need of a solution.

Silvia Masciocchi replies that the decision must be taken mutually for a viable solution.

Luciano Musa adds that the CB has to decide considering the different opinions.

Marek Kowalski urges to proceed preferably with case 2A or alternatively with 2B, also independent of the Council.

Silvia Masciocchi warns not to preempt the decision by the Council but to find a constructive way forward.

Luciano Musa adds that legal implications regarding existing MoUs and ICAs need to be kept in mind and that the CB therefore cannot take decisions unilaterally. However, the author list remains the responsibility of the CB.

Marek Kowalski thanks Luciano Musa for the clarification.

Karel Safarik poses the question “can we collaborate with institutes that support the war?” and reiterates the importance of considering the individual statements and decisions of the different institutes.

Luciano Musa states that the observer status of the Russian ministry of science and education which funds the institutes, was suspended by the Council on March 8 as a reaction to the invasion of Ukraine. This is part of a package of measures aimed at sanctioning Russia for the invasion of Ukraine.

Karel Safarik exclaims that, although members of the Kurchatov Institute on March 3, 2022 collectively signed the petition, this is in contradiction with the official policies and position.

Luciano Musa adds that this also applies to some of the other institutes.

John Harris expresses gratitude towards the MB and CB for the effort in dealing with the other LHC experiments as well as the CERN management. While he supports case 2B he proposes to hold a straw vote.

Silvia Masciocchi concludes that the other three experiments support case 2B and that a format should be found that would be consistent with the overall decision.

Luciano Musa proposes a binding vote for case 2B which would be in line with the other experiments.

Jesus Guillermo Nuno Contreras inquires about the other cases.

Silvia Masciocchi replies that there is a clear request for case 2B and proposes to vote on it.

John Harris motions this proposal.

Peter Braun Munzinger seconds the proposal.

Jesus Guillermo Nuno Contreras inquires about how many votes are required.

Silvia Masciocchi notes that it requires  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the votes cast.

John Harris agrees with this procedure as it deals with the author list.

David Evans obtains confirmation that this deals with pre-prints.

Anton Andronic adds that the disclaimer must be included.

Luciano Musa reminds that the disclaimer only appears when the paper gets published and is therefore not applicable here.

Piero Antonioli reaffirms that only case 2 will be endorsed.

Silvia Masciocchi confirms that case 2 expressed by the following proxy "Do you support a modified "CASE 2" scenario, described as 2B, which applies to all publications to be submitted to arXiv and journals with "The ALICE Collaboration" only, without names and without institutions until the ALICE CB decides on how to handle the authors list?" will be voted on.

The survey is opened and the result of the 77 votes cast is as follows.

- In favor: 62
- Opposed: 8
- Abstain: 7

As the majority endorses this proposal and is thereby accepted by the CB.

In accepting this decision Luciano Musa states that an engagement will take place with those who opposed and abstained from this endorsement.

Next a decision on a disclaimer was taken following the suggestion of John Harris and also to proceed in conjunction with the other experiments.

Silvia Masciocchi continues by announcing that a straw vote will be held to endorse the use of the disclaimer and that the survey will be modified accordingly to read as follows “Do you support the proposal under "CASE 1" with a disclaimer mentioning the Russian invasion of the Ukraine?”

Spencer Klein inquires whether this will only apply to case 1.

Silvia Masciocchi reiterates that the opinion of the CB regarding the use of the disclaimer in publications needs to be tested.

Luciano Musa adds that with case 1 it is aimed to have a decision before June regarding a policy on publications with a disclaimer depending on whether the submission was before or after 24 February 2022.

John Harris reiterates that this vote will be an indication for the CB and MB how to deal with publications before and after 24 February 2022.

Luciano Musa points to slide 10 and the fact that this is not the final wording and that it helps to guide the CB and MB.

Spencer Klein finds that the wording is not strong enough.

Silvia Masciocchi reminds that this is not a binding vote but merely a guideline.

John Harris declares a motion for a straw vote.

Johanna Stachel seconds this motion.

The straw vote is opened under the survey “Strategy” and 71 votes (including proxies) are cast. The outcome is as follows.

- In favor: 53
- Opposed: 8
- Abstain: 10

John Harris is certain that the CB will be prudent in the way the author list will be handled.

Luciano Musa reminds that this information will also provide important input for the RRB meeting on April 25.

## **Adjourn**

Silvia Masciocchi concludes by reiterating that these discussions are needed to reach decisions going forward. She thanks all members for the open and respectful exchange and conduct in helping each other find solutions during these difficult times. She closes this meeting by reminding the members to continue with providing more input to the CB and MB.