

---

Proposed written form of Supernova Cosmology Project rules & procedures

---

LAST UPDATE: 5 December 2001 by I. Hook

- 0.1 preamble by Saul
- 0.2 SCP mission and context

I - rules

- I.1 membership
- I.2 authorship
- I.3 data access
- I.4 software access
- I.5 publications and talks

II - procedures

- II.1 collab coordination
- II.2 collab meetings
- II.3 exec meetings
- II.4 publications and talks

---

Preamble by Saul

Since 1987, the Supernova Cosmology Project (SCP) has been developing new techniques, instrumentation, and analyses to study supernovae in order to learn about the cosmology of our universe. During this time, the SCP has grown from a few-person team to a successful international collaboration, with individuals and even groups at several institutions. Generally, the rules of the collaboration have been understood informally, and when there were any doubts it was easy to discuss it with each of the members of the collaboration.

As the group has expanded and moved beyond Berkeley, this approach has of course become more difficult to use. With people in different locations, it is harder for everybody in the team to know what all the others have been doing and are doing currently. Not only does this make it more difficult to coordinate the work, but it also means that there are fewer opportunities for a common understanding of our procedures and rules to be shared informally.

During this expansion, I have also continued the practice of speaking to each of the non-temporary team members to get a consensus when there were more difficult decisions to be made, or competing goals to be balanced. This has become a very unwieldy procedure -- even more so, now that the international groups are themselves expanding.

Clearly, the answer is to try to set down on paper an understanding of the rules of our collaboration that were previously unwritten rules, and to develop new procedures to help us to organize our efforts and balance our team goals. At the last collaboration meeting in Berkeley, we chose an "executive committee" to gather and represent the consensus of the team. The committee consists of Greg Aldering, Ariel Goobar, Isobel Hook, Reynald Pain, and myself chairing. This committee is intended to be a major evolutionary advance over my calling every individual team member to find team consensus! Moreover, this committee has begun drafting the following written set of rules and procedures for our collaboration.

Our goal here has been to capture the most important principles and rules of our collaboration, and also to lay out some new procedures to streamline our international team's efforts. This will obviously be an evolving document, as we learn what procedures work best, as different scientific and administrative personnel come and go, and as our scientific needs and contexts change. We ask that all the members of the Supernova Cosmology Project read these rules and procedures and suggest to the executive committee appropriate changes and updates, both now and over the years of collaboration to come.

---

The SCP mission and its context among related projects:

The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Supernova Cosmology Group has initiated several collaborations aimed at studying supernovae and using them to measure cosmological parameters.

(1) The first of these collaborations, the Supernova Cosmology Project, has been developing new techniques, instrumentation, and analyses to measure the cosmological parameters  $\Omega_{\text{M}}$ ,  $\Omega_{\text{Lambda}}$ , and  $w$  using Type Ia supernovae (SNe~Ia).

(2) The second of these collaborations, the Nearby Supernova Factory is currently being set up. It consists of a systematic study of a

large sample of nearby supernovae, focusing on refining supernovae as distance indicators.

(3) A third collaboration, the SuperNova /Acceleration Probe (SNAP), is also currently being formed. SNAP is a satellite project, dedicated to measurements of the cosmological constants and the study of the “dark energy” that may be accelerating the universe’s expansion.

Each of these three collaborations has its own membership list and its own collaboration rules. Given the strong overlap of interests among these three projects, it is anticipated that there will be significant interaction between them, as well as cases of individuals and institutions who are participating in more than one of these collaborations. Issues related to the coordination and interaction of these separate collaborations will be handled by cross-collaboration liaison committees.

The following describes the rules and procedures which members of the Supernova Cosmology Project, the first of these collaborations, agree to follow.

---

## I - Rules

---

### I.1 Membership

Principle: To encourage people to spend a significant amount of time on this project.

Documentation Principle: Lists of all members of each group discussed below will be maintained on a collaboration web site, with the help of the international group leaders.

#### I.1.1 Collaboration members

The expectation is that members have the SCP as their main research program and/or fill current specific needs/roles. Examples of the latter, to be termed "niche members," include:

- lead organizer for a given observatory’s proposals and observing
- observer who is an expert in a critical type of observation.

Collaboration members are expected to help guide the direction of the

SCP's science, proposing new routes, plans, and approaches that might better achieve our larger goals.

Collaboration members will not compete with the SCP for resources, observing resources, or science goals, nor join other collaborations that are doing so.

#### I.1.2 Affiliate members

There is also an "affiliate" collaboration type. For example, someone who is collaborating for a specific data set or a specific analysis project.

#### I.1.3 Initiation of membership

New members are approved by the collaboration decision mechanism (described below at I.1.5).

#### I.1.4 Expiration of membership

Members may be inactive for up to a year (judged on the honor system by members themselves) without losing their membership from the collaboration. They may request longer periods in specific cases. If they know they intend to leave sooner than this they should inform the collaboration. The members' active/inactive dates should be noted on the web-page membership list.

Individuals whose membership has expired no longer have access to the data, unless by agreement from the executive committee (defined below). (See section on data access below.)

Individuals whose membership has expired no longer have access to the group's software, unless by agreement from the executive committee. (See section on software access below.)

#### I.1.5 Membership subgroups

##### I.1.5.a Collaboration board

A subset of the members form a collaboration board. The collaboration board consists of faculty, staff scientist members of the collaboration and Postdocs who have been members for more than a year. Niche members are not included in the collaboration board by default but may be invited to participate at the discretion of the executive committee. In occasional cases a conflict of interest may

make it difficult for ordinary members to be included. These exceptions will be decided by the group leaders or executive committee.

#### I.1.5.b Executive committee:

The executive committee is a subset of members of the collaboration board. Its membership will be decided by the collaboration board. It is anticipated that the executive committee will include leaders (or their representatives) of the major institutions involved in the collaboration. The executive committee relies on advice from the collaboration board to guide the efforts of the collaboration. The executive committee will try to streamline the process of consensus-building among the collaboration board members, and to capture and implement this consensus. Final decision-making authority rests with the executive committee.

---

### I.2 Authorship

I.2.1 The author list for collaboration papers (as described below) is assumed to include the members of the collaboration board, except for niche collaboration members.

I.2.2 Niche collaboration members will be authors at the discretion of their group leaders (if appropriate) and by agreement of the executive committee. Such inclusion will depend on the relevance of the niche collaboration member's role to the particular paper. (Some niche member roles, of course, maybe relevant to all papers.) Niche collaboration members are strongly encouraged to clarify their specific authorship expectations in advance.

I.2.3 Members outside the collaboration board, such as affiliate members and students, may also be included on author lists at the discretion of their group leaders (if applicable) and the exec committee. Such inclusion will depend on the relevance of said individual's role to the particular paper. Such individuals are encouraged to clarify their specific authorship expectations in advance.

I.2.4 Inactive members are assumed to be authors on papers that came out of their active period of participation.

---

### I.3 - Data access

Principle: Collaboration members have access to the data

#### I.3.1 Collaboration data

##### I.3.1.a Raw data is available to all collaboration members

ACTION: still to be determined is a mechanism for this, e.g database made available, etc.

##### I.3.1.b Members will not spread collaboration data, at any stage of reduction, or information about unpublished results.

Members will not discuss collaboration plans, or results of collaboration planning analyses, outside of the collaboration without prior approval by the collaboration board/exec committee.

#### I.3.2 Requests from other projects for data

I.3.2.a If the request is not time-critical, prior approval by collaboration board/exec committee is required. (A subset of members may feel that they are interested in the science or have contributed significantly, and may wish to be included in any publication that results from the data.)

I.3.2.b For time critical request (e.g., those at the telescope), the run coordinator decides whether to take the data. A decision can be made afterwards about who should be on any papers resulting from the data. At minimum, any beneficiary of the data should include a statement acknowledging the SCP and the individuals who have rendered assistance, including, but not limited to, the observers and the proposal writers. For example:

"The authors wish to thank the Observer1, Observer2, .... ObserverN, Writer1, Writer2, ..., WriterN, and the Supernova Cosmology Project for ADJECTIVE data [of XXXX.] [included in this paper.]"

---

### I.4 - Software access

I.4.1 Core software developed for the group, designed to accomplish the main goals of the project is considered group software.

Members should not distribute group software outside the collaboration without prior approval of the exec committee /

collaboration board.

- I.4.2 Software brought into the collaboration from outside is exempt, so long as it is not further modified using group intellectual property. (In all cases, the author is encouraged to retain the original.) Tools aimed at more generic tasks are also likely to be exempt. Borderline cases will be decided by the exec committee.
  - I.4.3 Any generally useful tool that is not specific to the aims of the group can be distributed outside the collaboration & used at any time by the author. Borderline cases will be decided by the exec committee.
  - I.4.4 The exec committee / collaboration board can agree to share group software with outside collaborations or researchers. Such an arrangement is contingent on agreement to distribution restrictions by said outside collaborations or researchers. Specific additional terms can be imposed if the group so desires.
- 

## I.5 - Publications & talks

Principle: To balance the possible need of the collaboration to re-analyze their data (including already-published data) and officially approve such analyses, while giving people room to work on data in as many ways as possible.

- I.5.1. To encourage people to come up with ideas, it is likely that the person who takes the lead on a paper would be the first author. Authorship issues will be ultimately decided by the exec committee.
- I.5.2 Any paper written by a collaboration member that uses data, software, or internal group knowledge that comes out of the collaboration's work is assumed to be a collaboration paper (unless otherwise agreed in advance).
- I.5.3 The collaboration recognizes and is supportive of papers which, while not using collaboration data, group software (see I.4.1) or internal collaboration knowledge, are useful for the collaboration. Such papers would not be considered general collaboration papers, but the status of any proposed paper should be established with the executive committee in advance.
- I.5.4 Members may write conference proceedings as a single author with the footnote "for the Supernova Cosmology Project: ....list of names

here....". This footnote should be placed at the bottom of the first page (i.e. not as an end note) where at all possible.

I.5.5 Members may write or participate in review papers that reference collaboration work without these papers being considered general collaboration papers. If there are any doubts about the use of collaboration data (published or not) in these review papers, then the collaboration should be asked in advance for its decision (following the procedure given above).

I.5.6 A sunrise clause applies to being an author (however there is no sunrise clause to become a collaboration member.) The nominal sunrise period is one year for pre-doctoral researchers, and six months for other more senior researchers. This period can be accelerated or delayed at the discretion of an individual's group leader. In the absence of a group leader, the collaboration board will set variances to the nominal sunrise period.

---

## II - Procedures.

---

### II.1 Collaboration coordination

There is a need to concentrate on high-priority tasks and to produce results faster. In order to do that we must improve the interaction between collaboration members.

A standing agenda item for all meetings (collaboration and exec committee meetings) will be to identify top priority tasks and what is holding them up.

Specialized working groups should be created whenever needed to concentrate on time-critical tasks. Each working group has one person in charge who is also has the responsibility of keeping the executive board informed of the group's progress.

Current working groups are:

- 99' low-z data reduction
- HST photometry (?)

Working groups should post times when they will be meeting/phoning



and keep a web-based e-mail archive of the relevant correspondence along with other documents for reference by other collab members.

A brief report should be provided by all working groups at each collab meeting. If a longer report is requested by the exec committee this should be included on the agenda for the forthcoming meeting.

---

## II.2 - collaboration meetings

Meetings of the whole collaboration will take place every second month to allow discussion of progress and sticking points for the science analysis and papers. At least two of these will cover proposals (3 weeks ahead of first proposal deadline and one after the results of the proposals are out).

The agenda will be coordinated by the exec committee and posted in the collaboration web-page.

For each meeting a different person will coordinate the preparation for the meeting. The exec committee will choose the person for the first meeting (we choose to appoint Saul for this!), after that the coordinator for the next meeting will be chosen at the current meeting.

## II.3 Proposals and observing:

0. 8 weeks before the earliest deadline, time at one of the 2-monthly meetings will be assigned collect action items in preparation for the proposal discussion (e.g. collect information on new instrumentation & sensitivities) .

1. At least 3 weeks before the earliest proposal deadline in a given campaign (semester, typically; year, sometimes), we meet (by conference call, or videoconference) to plan (this will be absorbed into the appropriate 2-monthly meeting)

The coming semester(s) observing plan is then written down and posted on the collab web-site, so that it can be referred to while writing the proposals.

2. At least 1 week before each proposal deadline, a draft of that proposal is sent to the collaboration to get feedback and agreement.

This draft should follow what is stated on the web site, or a strong early warning should be sent to the collaboration.

3. One person should be assigned to track the time assignment and scheduling at each telescope, i.e. to know

- (1) when we find out what time we have;
- (2) when we have to tell the telescope's scheduler our requirements.

4. A meeting (conference call or video-conference) must be held after we know what time we have, to prepare the final observing plan, and to assign jobs and responsibilities.

5. At least Three jobs will be assigned for each run:

1. Planner (plans what telescopes observe when)
2. Run coordinator - keeps track during the run
3. Follow-up coordinator

---

## II.4 Exec committee meetings

Jeanne Miller (LBL Admin. for SCP) will coordinate the Agenda She will collect agenda items and put them on the collaboration web-page.

To submit an item:

- check the web site that its not already there
- e-mail Jeanne and Saul the new item

NOTE it is very important that Jeanne gets these, not just Saul since Saul may be away from his e-mail.

Agenda will be sent to exec committee and posted in collaboration web-site.

The minutes of the exec committee meeting will be also posted in the collaboration web-site.

---

## II.5 publications, talks and press releases

### II.5.1 publications

Members should provide the exec committee with an outline of concepts of potential relevant papers (as early as possible, but

before putting substantial effort on the paper) to encourage participation and to settle potential authorship issues early.

The exec committee would decide on cases where the paper is unrelated to the mission of the group and can go ahead without consulting the entire collaboration.

In cases where the exec committee consider the paper is relevant to the collaboration they would discuss the authorship with the collaboration board.

Decisions would be made based on guidelines described in the rules section 3.

Procedures once a draft has been written

Member brings a paper draft to the exec committee

Exec committee appoints two internal referees to speed up the process.

Based on the referee report the exec committee then decides whether:

- (0) the paper should not go any further
- (1) the author needs help from other group members and proposes how to go ahead
- (2) only minor changes are required.
- (3) the paper is in good shape and it is ready to be discussed by the whole collaboration. The executive board alone decides on a response time (not less than one week or more than one month) depending on the nature of the paper, with the goal of getting things published quickly but still with the validation of the collaboration.

Paper should go to the whole collaboration not more than 3 times:

- draft 1: first attempt, collab may propose major changes
- draft 2: answers first comments. Collab may still propose minor changes
- draft 3: ready to publish, cosmetic corrections only

At each stage the exec committee proposes time-scale for comments and revisions. Collab members should try hard to meet the deadlines or report problems in meeting the deadlines to exec committee.

The author should answer all comments at least once.  
Any disputes will be settled by the exec committee.  
Final submission of the paper is approved by the exec committee.

## II.5.2 Attending conferences & Talks

A list of SCP-related talks will be kept on the collaboration web-site. Exec committee group keeps an eye on what talks are coming up and who is proposing to give them. The intention is to distribute talks geographically - e.g. Europeans may want to be high-profile in Europe helping people who are on the job market.

Members should let the exec committee and the Exec administrative secretary (currently Jeanne Miller) know as soon as possible that they have been invited to give a talk. Exec committee may propose somebody else to give the talk (primarily for collaboration conference talks). Colloquia should also be added to the list if these can be transferred to someone else.

Standard information e.g. plots of results, will be kept on the web and it is OK for any member to use that, as well as anything we have clearly published. There will be another category of slides that everyone can use but not distribute further (because of data rights).

Guidelines for sensitive issues will be given on web to help answer typical questions that are asked at meetings. e.g. FAQ on web (for general use, not just for talks).

Members should contact the exec committee about new content that they intend to talk about (preferably by sending electronic versions of the transparencies. The transparencies would not necessarily be made available for the whole group to use, unless the member wanted this)

The exec committee in consultation with the collaboration board will decide whether view-graphs are OK.

Cases where significant parts of the talk are new to the person, The exec committee may suggest that the person rehearses the talk in advance, and suggest certain people to listen to it.

## II.5.3 Press releases

The guidelines for submitting papers should apply also to press releases. A first draft of the text should be submitted to the exec

committee, who will decide whether rewording is needed before it is sent to the whole collaboration.

---

In SCP Mission and Context:

++++ also mention intermediate search group?

ACTION: Refine this statement - mention theory explicitly ?

---

In I.2:

ACTION: Does more need to be said about authorship expectations for inactive members?

---

After I.2:

ACTION: Send e-mail out to everyone asking them to say what their role is. What they think they will do, What time they have available to do these things (observing, data reduction) What other collaborations are you in ? Do this once a year.

ACTION: Need a list of collaborators names on the web. Design a transparency of names and disclaimer (this is an evolving collaboration).

ACTION: Make grandfather list & distribute (to who ?) with explanations of specific exceptions.

---

---

Corrections/ Questions from the SCP meeting in Barcelona.

I.1.5.a Collaboration board:

..members of the collaboration and POSTDOCS who have been members for more than one year. (DONE IMH)

\*\* - interaction with SNAP etc - e.g. software (Alex Kim) Peter worried

\*\* about what happens if he publishes something for SNAP - is that a

\*\* conflict for SCP (e.g. if other team uses it for something).

- \*\* - Mission statement should allow us to evolve -
- \*\* should include type IIs (Peter)
- \*\* e.g. our expertise is finding & using transients to do cosmology

- Whole things needs proof reading - section numbers etc  
define terms & put them at the end (Rob).

\*\* - dont use words exec 'BOARD' (board means something else)  
(PANEL? -IMH)

## AUTHORSHIP

- I.2.3 ..such as affiliate members (AND STUDENTS) -Rob  
(DONE IMH)

\*\* - I.2.4 Open ended (Rob). Reconsider Inactive members on papers (e.g  
\*\* Ivan, Heidi, Thom York). Tony can find us some examples of other  
\*\* collaborations.

\*\* - Include technical people on papers?

I.3.1.b - need a reference to talks here. Also para about not  
discussing plans is a bit severe (do we mean discussing with  
other scientists/ competitors). (Rob)

Need to stress point about not telling people what we're doing. (Peter)

I.4.3 author cant distribute software but neither should anyone else!

Same for the general software. (OK? IMH)

keep Distribution of software down because otherwise someone has to  
support it.

I.5.3 software should say 'group software' & refers to section I.4.1.  
(DONE IMH)

General - how do we take advantage of interaction with other groups  
without affecting the collaboration badly.

I.5.6 postdoctoral researchers - reword that because we mean everyone  
who has a PhD ( not just postdocs) (DONE - IMH)

I.5.1 State explicitly that its the exec that decides on authorship.

(DONE IMH)

Mention Press releases in procedures. (exec board can decide that).

(DONE? IMH)

Section II.2 - need to define three people to coordinate runs

1. Planner (what tells observe when)
2. Run coordinator - keeps track during the run
3. Follow up coordinator

(DONE IMH)

II.4.2 - Add colloquia to the list, but only if you think they could be transferred to someone else. (DONE IMH)

-----

Other notes:

When will we take nominations for next year's exec?

- decided current exec stays like this for one more year.

NB must go through the rules with people who aren't here.

When do the rules take effect?

- decided that the spirit of the rules takes effect now!

\*\* - Need a section that deals with how this document gets updated.

\*\* (e.g. "This document is endorsed by the Exec committee at any time

\*\* after consideration of the views of the collaboration" (or just the

\*\* board?).

-----