Bylaws of the CLAS Collaboration

Last revision: June 2021
(maintained by Bryan McKinnon mckinnon@jlab.org)

Motions, resolutions, and procedures approved by the Collaboration during formal business meetings which are currently in effect to govern implementation of various Charter policies. Categories:

A. Duties of Full Members (A1.Shift Staffing, & A2. Service Work)
B. Election of New Members
C. Publications
D. Talks (D1. CLAS Speakers Committee, & D2. Release of Scientific Results)
E. Analysis of existing data (CLAS Approved Analyses -- "CAA")
F. Data Cooking (Offline Technical Working Group)
G. Review of Proposals and Letters of Intent

More extensive cross-referencing may be found in the Master Index

****

A1. DATA-TAKING SHIFT POLICY

I. General Policies

CLAS shifts are manned by two people at all times, one shift expert (or "leader") and one shift worker. Expert shifts start at 00:00, 08:00 and 16:00 and worker shifts start at 07:00, 15:00 and 23:00.

Each collaborating institution has a contact person responsible for filling all shifts assigned to that institution. The method for choosing shift personnel is left to the discretion of the contact person and his or her institution, but must conform to the overall guidelines described here. The current shift schedule and shift-schedule editor are available at https://www.jlab.org/Hall-B/shifts .

This by-law only deals with general shift-taking concerned with experimental data-taking. It does not deal with specialized shift-taking concerned with a particular detector or software element, nor with any other activity performed by collaboration members in fulfillment of their MOU or Agreement or physics program.

II. Shift Taker's Qualifications and Conduct of Operations

All "Expert" and "Worker" shift takers must meet certain criteria itemized here. In addition, anyone participating in data taking with CLAS must have a level of safety and radiation training described in the CLAS "Conduct of Operations" (COO) document. It provides an authoritative discussion of shift operations, including the duties and responsibilities of the shift Expert and the shift Worker. The COO is presently available at https://www.jlab.org/Hall-B/run-web.

"Workers"

All full and term members of the CLAS Collaboration are eligible for worker shifts. Limited members and non-members, including new graduate students, may be assigned shifts by the institutional contact persons supervising the filling of the shift schedule. Undergraduate students may not be assigned shifts without prior approval of the Physics Division Liaison (PDL, a.k.a. CLAS COP).

Prior to taking his or her first-ever scheduled shift, a person must be an observer on at least one shift in order to become familiar with procedures and (typically) to finish reading the required documents listed in the COO.

"Experts"

The list of expert shift takers who can act as shift leaders is determined by the PDL, who is responsible for the safe and effective operation of the system. Experts must be full or term members of CLAS. Expert status implies, among other criteria determined by the PDL, experience in running CLAS shifts (at least 8 worker shifts), not necessarily expert knowledge of hardware and software components of the system.

Oral communication skills that enable effective communication with the accelerator staff are required for shift leaders. The PDL must be satisfied that any given shift leading expert has adequate language skills.

If an individual is not qualified as an expert, the shift schedule page will not accept him or her for an expert shift.

III. Shift Scheduling

At six month intervals, the collaboration Shift Scheduler will revise the membership list of the collaboration maintained by the Membership Committee. Shifts will be assigned in 4 day blocks to all member institutions in proportion to their number of full and term members. Limited members will NOT be included in this enumeration.

A shift-trading period will be organized under the leadership of the Shift Scheduler to allow foreign, domestic, and local institutions to optimize their periods of shift-taking responsibility to their needs.

Any persons added to an institution's list of Worker shift takers by the institution's contact person will NOT thereby automatically become members of the CLAS collaboration. For example, new graduate students who are assigned shifts are not thereby made members of CLAS. By assigning shifts to non-members, an institution's contact person is certifying that the persons so assigned will have met the Worker shift taker's requirements by the time the shift starts.

The PDL has the authority to reject a person for a shift if he or she thinks that the person is unqualified. The relevant institution then has responsibility for finding a suitable replacement.

If a shift goes unfilled, either by no-show or no-qualify, the incident will be brought to the attention of the Membership Committee for possible action, such as removing institutional shift credits.

A2. Service Groups

(Edited and moved to a new section in the Charter)

****

B. NEW MEMBERS

The following resolution clarifies the content of some forms of information exchange with prospective new members that were already a required component of previously existing procedure. Indeed it is deliberately formatted as a document suitable for transmission to potential candidates. It also refines some procedural steps from the earlier policy for consistency with more recent developments (e.g. the passage of an explicit Shift Staffing Policy), and adds the authority of formal approval by the Full Collaboration.

Policy on Consideration of New Members

Introduction:

The CLAS collaboration welcomes applications from groups or individuals interested in becoming full or limited members. Each class of membership has a set of rights and responsibilities that are matched according to a long-term or a short-term working arrangement with the collaboration.

A limited member becomes a member for a specific set of experiments, often for one specific experiment. This member class is discussed in the CLAS Charter.

A full member will join as a member of an existing CLAS group or as part of a new CLAS group. We regard the acceptance of a new full member as a significant commitment by both the member and the collaboration. Both sides should be confident that the responsibilities assumed by the new member are appropriate, i.e., well defined, significant, and consistent with available resources.

A primary part of the application is the definition of an Agreement which outlines the activities of the new member to conduct experiments and analyze data with CLAS. New people joining existing CLAS groups can join existing Agreements if they are appropriately extended.

Procedure:

Following initial contact with a member of the Coordinating Committee, the following procedures will be used.

1. Preliminary discussions with various members of the collaboration (including the Coordinating Committee, users, and CEBAF staff) will help each applicant to

understand the workings of the collaboration and the views of its members. The Coordinating Committee should lead this process. A tentative MOU or Agreement will be constructed identifying specific hardware, software, or service responsibilities. At any time in this process, the applicant could become a limited member.

2. The tentative MOU or Agreement will be submitted in writing to the CLAS Membership Committee. The applicant will meet with committee representatives to modify and complete the MOU or Agreement as necessary. The Membership Committee will vote in a secret ballot whether or not to forward the application to the full collaboration. A 2/3 majority is required for passage. In the interest of developing a successful relationship, the applicants should meet with committee members prior to the meeting. Unsuccessful applications can be reconsidered.
3. The Membership Committee will distribute the proposed application (including MOU or Agreement) to each full member of the collaboration at least one month before the collaboration meeting at which the application will be considered. The case will be presented at a full collaboration meeting and voted on by confidential ballot coordinated by the Membership Committee. A 2/3 majority is required for acceptance.

The purpose of this set of bylaws is to initiate standard procedures for the nomination of individuals by the Membership Committee for membership in the collaboration, and for conducting the election of new members. The Charter determines the qualifications of new members, and that the members must be notified of the list of nominees at least 30 days in advance of the election. In addition the members of the Collaboration have voted that the nominee or nominator must appear in person at the meeting at which the elections are held.

Procedures are hereby presented concerning nominations, elections and information to be furnished to the Membership Committee.

1. Each year a notice will be sent by the Chair of the New Members committee to all current full members announcing the call for the nomination of new members.
2. The New Members committee will request that the nominator furnish information that shows that the nominee is qualified for full membership. Normally this means that the nominator should show that the nominee is listed on a MOU or Agreement and is aware of the responsibilities of membership, as specified in the Collaboration Charter and elsewhere in these By-Laws.
3. The New Members committee shall verify that those nominated are qualified under the rules of the Charter and report their findings to the nominator.
4. The New Members committee shall send information on the qualified nominees to the Chair of the Membership committee. The Chair of the Membership committee will then proceed to implement the remaining steps under 2. and 3. of the updated Membership Policy & Procedure approved in 9/91 (above).

****

C. PUBLICATIONS

Introduction: Section XI of the CLAS Charter provides the general rules for publishing results in peer-reviewed journals. The language in that section was adopted as a charter amendment in January 1998. This bylaw is intended to fill in the procedural details of this process.

1. *When is a scientific result ready for publication by CLAS?*
    a. **Normal Process**: The Physics Working Groups (PWG) have the initial responsibility to recommend to the Coordinating Committee (CC) when a new CLAS result is ready to be published. The definition of, and the procedures for releasing new scientific results itemized in Bylaw D2 (on Talks) cover this first stage of the publication process.
    b. **Fast Track**: In exceptional cases, the authors of a paper may request a Fast Track designation for their paper. In such cases, the authors will submit a written request to the Chair of the Coordinating Committee, specifying in detail the need for Fast Track designation. At a minimum, the reasons submitted must defend the exceptional importance of the results and show clear indications of imminent publication of similar or confirming results by other laboratories. The Coordinating Committee will decide if Fast Track status is to be granted, and will inform the authors of this decision. If Fast Track status is granted, the Coordinating Committee will further decide whether or not a PWG analysis committee is required, with the condition that any decision to bypass such PWG review must be unanimous. Turnaround times on other review steps will be adjusted as indicated in *2)* and *5)* below.
2. *When should an Ad-Hoc committee be designated, and how long should it have to do its work?*

    The CC will appoint an Ad-Hoc committee as soon as it is informed that a paper is being written. It is recommended that lead authors ask for an Ad-Hoc committee for their paper as soon as practical, in order that the concerns and criticisms of the committee can be addressed in a timely way. The committee can work with the authors to discuss issues related to publishability of a paper. When the Ad-Hoc committee is asked to review a finished draft of a paper, it should act within 15 days with recommendations regarding the paper -- reduced to 7 days for Fast Track.

3. *What should be the composition of the Ad-Hoc publication committees?*

    The charter calls for an Ad-Hoc committee of usually 3 individuals tobe designated by the Coordinating Committee (CC) to review each paper presented to the CC for consideration. The Ad-Hoc committee shall be composed of persons not directly involved in the results to be published, and will have representation from at least two of the CLAS Physics Working Groups. At least one member shall be from the working group which is developing the paper. The members of the Ad-Hoc committee shall be announced to the Collaboration.

4. *Collaboration Review Mechanism:*

    The paper will be available for review by the Collaboration in a secure (password-protected) area of the CLAS Web pages. No member of the Collaboration may disseminate the draft paper to persons outside the Collaboration until final Collaboration approval for publication is granted. In particular, distribution to e-print servers is not allowed until collaboration approval is granted.

5. *Time Limits:*

The normal comment period for feedback from the Collaboration to the authors and Ad-Hoc committee shall be at least 15 days. For FastTrack, the Collaboration shall be notified of FastTrack status and the draft shall be made available to the Collaboration for initial reading at the same time that it is assigned to the Ad Hoc committee. The feedback period is reduced to 7 days beyond the period specified in *2)* for Ad-Hoc committee recommendations.

6. *When is a paper approved for publication?*

   If there are NO comments from the Collaboration during the specified comment period, approval is granted, according to the charter. If there are one or more criticisms, then the authors must address these criticisms. The Ad-Hoc committee will decide whether to accept the responses, and whether to restart the comment period clock. In case of conflicts, the appeals mechanism in charter section XI.6 will be followed.

7. *Authorship:*
   a. The rules of eligibility for co-authorship on CLAS Collaboration publications are given in Charter Section 11.B. Names will appear on an author list on an "opt-in" basis, meaning that each individual eligible member must assert his or her wish to be a co-author according to the following procedure. The following points specify the opt-in procedure:
      i. A paper submitted for Ad Hoc review shall carry the names of "lead" authors who are involved in the actual writing or who did the main work for that paper. While all authors bear some responsibility for the accuracy of the results reported in the paper, these "lead" authors, whose names will appear at the beginning of the author list, have the principal responsibility for the correctness of all details of the paper.
      ii. The Membership Committee shall prepare a list of eligible co-authors for the paper prior to the Collaboration-wide review. A web-based "opt-in/opt-out" selection page shall be prepared by the Membership Committee before the paper is released for this review.
      iii. The web-based opt-in/out interface must display the following text next to "opt-in" selection box: "I have participated in the CLAS Collaboration's physics program during the time leading to this publication. I have read this publication, and support, to the best of my understanding, the scientific conclusions set forth therein. I hereby exercise my eligibility to be listed as a co-author on this publication."
      iv. The announcement of the Collaboration-wide review must remind all members that they must actively choose to be co-authors. The authorship interests of junior term members should be made clear to them by their mentors or Institutional Representatives (IR's). The lead authors shall be responsible for identifying relevant limited members who should be listed as authors.
      v. The full set of eligible authors must be visible to all members during the review period. The sub-set of members who have opted-in for co-authorship will also be visible during the review period. It is the responsibility of IR's to check that errors in the eligibility list are corrected in due time. The IR's also should make efforts to contact members who may be out of email contact during a review period.

vi. At the end of the Collaboration-wide review, the lead authors must prepare a draft of the paper with all co-authors listed, and announce to the Collaboration that it is available for final review of the author list. Since some time elapses between the end of the formal review period and the actual submission of the paper, any late opt-in choices can still be made. The period between the end of the collaboration-wide review and the submission of the paper shall be not less than 7 (seven) days. Any late additions to the author list must be made via personal appeal to the Membership Committee, not via the on-line voting page, and the Membership Committee shall verify eligibility.

b. Term members who join the CLAS Collaboration will be included on CLAS publications after a six month waiting period. During this time the term members must demonstrate commitment to CLAS by doing service work for the Collaboration which was agreed upon at their time of joining. They will then be included as authors on CLAS publications (if they so choose) even if their own work did not directly contribute to the published analyses. The Membership Committee will judge whether the new term members have done suitable service work during the waiting period.

c. Term and full members who withdraw from the CLAS Collaboration will be included (if they so choose) as authors on CLAS papers submitted for six months following their departure. (Nothing in this bylaw changes the authorship provisions specified in the CLAS charter, specifically see Charter Section 11.B)

d. Author lists will be constructed as follows:

   i. CLAS Publications: The list of authors is to be alphabetical from A to Z. The lead authors, however, will be listed first, in an order of their choosing. The list of lead authors will be reviewed by the relevant PWG. In cases where results of a Ph.D. project are published, the name of the student is to be listed first, at least in the first publication of these results. Limited members added at the discretion of Spokespersons may be listed either among the lead authors or in the main body of the list. Disputes are to be mediated by the Coordinating Committee.

   ii. CLAS12 Publications: As defined in the previous article (C.7.d.i.) with the addition that the number of lead authors is restricted to be less than five with the possibility of exceptions for special cases that would need to be properly motivated by the leading authors and would be judged on by the Coordinating Committee.

****

D1. CLAS Collaboration Speakers' Committee

1. **Purpose, authorization, and powers**

   According to the CLAS Collaboration Charter, the accurate and broad dissemination of results to the scientific community by talks from members of the CLAS Collaboration is the responsibility of the CLAS Coordinating Committee. To that end, the Coordinating Committee hereby establishes a Collaboration Speakers' Committee (herein referred to as the CSC). Except in the matter of appeals, the decision of the

CSC concerning speaker selection will be accepted as the Coordinating Committee decision.

2. **Organization**
    a. The CSC will consist of one member from each physics working group (PWG) and two at-large members.
    b. All members of the CSC will normally serve for a term of two years, with terms staggered as determined by random selection for the first election of CSC membership. The terms will begin September 1 following the election.
        i. In case of a vacancy or resignation from the CSC, the replacement CSC representative will begin serving immediately upon designation, and that person's term will last for the remainder of the unfulfilled term.
        ii. No person may serve on the CSC for more than three consecutive terms.
    c. Each PWG will choose a representative and an alternate to the CSC.
        i. The alternate will serve in the absence of the chosen representative for any meeting and will exercise the same rights and responsibilities as the chosen representative for that meeting.
        ii. The term of the alternate representative is also two years.
        iii. In the case of a vacancy, the PWG will elect a person to fill the unfinished portion of the term vacated.
    d. The CLAS Coordinating Committee will choose two additional members for the CSC as at-large members and also select an alternate for each of the at-large members.
        i. The at-large members will be chosen such that their presence adds balance to the CSC in terms of representing, for instance, the interests of term members and international scientists.
        ii. The terms of the at-large members will be staggered so that a new at-large member is selected each year.
        iii. The two at-large members shall not be from the same physics working group.
        iv. The Coordinating Committee will rotate the selection of the two at-large members so that each working group is represented during any two-year period.
        v. In case of a vacancy, the Coordinating Committee will choose a person to fill the unfinished portion of the vacated term.
    e. A member of the Coordinating Committee cannot be a member of CSC.
    f. The CSC will elect a chair at the first meeting of the CSC following September 1. The chair will serve for one year, but may be re-elected to serve additional terms as chair.
3. **Responsibilities of the CSC**
    a. The CSC will actively solicit talks from conference organizers.
    b. The CSC will notify all CLAS Collaboration members of invitations for speakers to come from the collaboration.
    c. The CSC will select speakers to give talks using the procedure discussed in Section 4.
    d. The CSC will keep a listing of all talks given on CLAS results.
4. **Speaker selection by the CSC**
    a. All spokespersons of related experiments and the appropriate PWG representative will be requested to submit written opinions to the CSC to

inform the speaker selection process concerning any invited talk on CLAS results.

b. Members can nominate themselves or other persons to respond to an invitation to speak. Those nominations must be in writing. Members may also contribute opinions in writing concerning speaker selection or the suitability of a talk on the proposed topic.
c. The CSC will choose the speaker using criteria such as expertise, fairness, and service work.
    i. The main criterion is demonstrated expertise in the subject suggested by the conference organizers, particularly when an individual receives an invitation.
    ii. Speaker choice will also be influenced by previous speaking history, the need to enhance the careers of junior members of the collaboration, and the quality and extent of a member's service work to CLAS.
    iii. The PWG input to the selection decision, provided by the PWG representative to the CSC, will be given substantial weight.
d. Appeals of any CSC decision can be made to the CLAS Coordinating Committee, which has the final decision on speaker selections in the case of appeal.

5. **Speaking activities covered by the CSC**
    a. Invited talks for university seminars.
        i. CLAS Collaboration members are free to accept invitations for seminars and colloquia at individual schools.
        ii. CLAS Collaboration members should notify the CSC of these seminars and colloquia.
        iii. All results shown must be approved for dissemination as detailed in the "CLAS Coordinating Committee Bylaws for Release of CLAS Results."
    b. Conference and workshop invited talks.
        i. CLAS Collaboration members who receive invitations to speak at a conference or workshop will pass that request to the CSC with a discussion of who should give the associated talk.
        ii. The CSC will select the speaker for that conference or workshop based on the procedure described in Section 4. The CSC will also take into account the information provided by the individual who received the invitation.
        iii. Some individuals may be uniquely qualified to give certain talks, such as overviews of activities at more than one laboratory. If, in the opinion of the CSC, less than half of the content of the talk refers directly to CLAS results, the CSC will not be required to select a speaker.
    c. Refereed contributed talks
        i. CLAS Collaboration members who wish to submit an abstract to an international conference or workshop for a refereed contribution will submit a request to the appropriate PWG.
        ii. PWG will decide what subjects are appropriate and submit a prioritized list of talks and suggested speakers to the CSC at least 3 weeks before the deadline for the conference or workshop.
        iii. The CSC will use these suggestions and the procedure in Section 4 to select speakers.
    d. Non-refereed contributed talks

i. CLAS Collaboration members who wish to submit abstracts for contributed talks to meetings of scientific organizations and societies (such as, for example, the American Physical Society) should submit a request to the appropriate PWG, providing the intended talk title, abstract, and conclusions.
ii. The PWG will approve or negotiate changes in the abstract with the member, and decide if the member's request is to be granted.

e. Presentations to the CLAS Collaboration
i. Initial presentation of approved scientific results will be at a CLAS Collaboration or PWG meeting. The CLAS Collaboration Chair and the PWG Chair will determine whether the presentation is to the PWG or to the entire collaboration, and the form of the presentation.
ii. The CLAS Collaboration Chair, with advice from the CSC, may request a talk be given at a collaboration meeting.

6. **Publication of talks**
   a. The CSC will receive for approval all printed versions of talks at least one week before the announced due date for submission for publication.
   b. The CSC has the right to order changes in the content if they are inconsistent with CLAS approved results.
   c. The speaker has right of appeal to the CLAS Coordinating Committee, which has the final decision on the appeal.
   d. The CSC will determine the byline appropriate for the publication.
7. **Archives of delivered talks**
   a. The CSC will maintain a library of all printed versions of conference talks.
      i. Any usage of these approved results for talks or presentations must carry attribution to the CLAS Collaboration
      ii. Access to the archive will be restricted to CLAS Collaboration members.
8. **Appeals** The CLAS Coordinating Committee will hear appeals on disagreements with CSC decisions. The decision of the CLAS Coordinating Committee on appeals is final.

****

D2. Bylaw Governing the Release of CLAS Scientific Results

1) **Scope of this by-law**

The release of scientific results to the public is governed by the procedures spelled out in this bylaw. This bylaw covers the results to be shown to the public by CLAS members in all cases, and the release of results to other scientists and to the public at large.

2) **Definition of "scientific result"**

The definition of what constitutes a scientific result is of necessity vague. An operational definition may be that a scientific result is any finding, in and of itself, of sufficient interest to warrant public presentation in a seminar, conference, workshop, or publication. All decisions concerning the appropriateness of releasing information should be addressed by discussion in physics working groups if at all possible. The Coordinating Committee is

the final arbiter of what constitutes a scientific result for the purposes of this bylaw, and that ruling is binding on collaboration members.

a) Examples of scientific results that require the use of the procedure outlined in Section 3 include cross sections, polarization observables, identification of new resonances or states, and analyses based on items such as these.
b) Examples of results that are not considered covered by the procedure in Section 3 include intermediate analysis results that in and of themselves do not permit preliminary or final conclusions to be drawn (e.g.: acceptance calculations, un-normalized invariant mass or missing mass histograms.)

3) Procedure for release of scientific results

A scientific result will be approved for public release using the following procedure.

a) The author(s) of the result will present the result to the appropriate PWG for discussion and critique. This presentation should generally be at a PWG meeting, but the PWG may elect to authorize the review in another manner.
b) The PWG, upon agreement with the result to be released, will authorize the author(s) of the result to present the results to the full CLAS Collaboration for a period of 30 days for review and comment. The Chair of the PWG will determine the means by which the results are to be presented for review, and will advise the Chair of the Coordinating Committee of that mechanism.
c) All comments and criticisms should be given to the author(s) in writing.
d) After the 30-day review period has expired, the Coordinating Committee will decide if the result is acceptable for release. The author(s) of the result will receive comment from the Coordinating Committee on the reasons for its decision.
e) A PWG may add preliminary results to its archives provided the results are clearly labeled as preliminary. These preliminary results are then available for public presentations using procedures and policies described under other applicable collaboration bylaws. These results need only be considered by the PWG as outlined in step (a) above and do not require steps (b)-(d) above.
f) Upon release, the PWG will add the results to the working group archive of approved results.
g) In exceptional cases, the PWG can request that the Coordinating Committee allow immediate release of a scientific result.
h) Results should not normally be communicated to non-CLAS members until they are reviewed and approved by an analysis review committee.

4) Procedure for the definition of standard methods

a. In the preparation of a scientific result, the exploitation of standard methods for the treatment and analysis of both data and simulation are encouraged in order to facilitate the approval process, consistency in the released analyses, and long-term data preservation. During a physics analysis review, non-standard methods require

justification and dedicated scrutiny, while already approved standard methods require just a proper use verification.

b. Examples of potential standard methods are: fiducial volume cuts, momentum corrections and kinematic fitting, particle identification, radiative corrections, simulation event generators and background subtraction.
c. A proposal to adopt a new standard method can be submitted to the relevant PWGs by a group of collaborators or even a single author if endorsed by the PWG. A standard method will be approved by a committee designated by the interested PWGs with one representative for each PWG and two or more members selected from a permanent pool of experts (detector and software). A new standard method could complement, partially revise, or supersede a previous existing standard method.
d. A standard method should be provided with a note explaining the procedure, the range of validity and data set of applicability, the parameters to be tuned to the desired precision, a metric to validate its correct use (i.e. check-plots), tags of keywords identifying the topic and a public code.
e. A library of the approved standard methods is overseen by the PWGs to provide the available state of-the-art methods as a reference for physics analyses and related reviews.

****

E. Analysis of Existing Data: "CLAS Approved Analysis (CAA)" Procedure for CLAS Members to Undertake New Analyses of Existing CLAS Data.

Given that there are reaction channels or observables present in the CLAS data sets which are not covered by any already-approved CLAS experiments, this policy regulates how existing full members of the CLAS Collaboration may gain approval of the whole Collaboration to undertake the relevant analysis.

Since all full members of the CLAS Collaboration have free and equal access to all CLAS data (Charter Section IX), this policy regulates the issue of priority of working on an analysis with a specific stated physics goal. This policy covers work that will NOT be separately presented to a Jefferson Lab PAC.

1. Each CAA must be approved by the relevant Physics Working Group (PWG) and by the full CLAS collaboration. The PWG will maintain a list of active CAAs.
2. Proposers must submit a written proposal to the relevant PWG. It must contain
    - - list of spokespersons with 1 contact person.
    - - specific data set and reaction channel to be analyzed. - discussion of the potential physics results to be gained from the analysis.
    - - discussion of the analysis methods planned with sample results from existing data where possible.
    - - discussion of the relationship to any existing CAA or PAC- approved experiment. The PWG coordinator should solicit comments from the spokespersons of any overlapping CAA or approved experiment.
3. The PWG coordinator will follow the standard methods for evaluation of PAC proposals of that group. There will be an evaluation of the CAA proposal by the PWG followed by a vote. The vote must occur at a publicly announced meeting with this CAA listed on the agenda. The PWG can vote to deny or approve the proposal or request resubmission with specified changes.

4. After the CAA is approved by the PWG, it will be presented to the full CLAS collaboration at a scheduled collaboration meeting. The collaboration can make it an official CAA with a 2/3 majority of the voting members present. The vote shall be by secret ballot.
5. The PWG will list all approved CAA's in a publicly accessible place.
6. The Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee will communicate the roster of approved CLAS analyses to the Chairperson of the PAC to make the PAC cognizant of physics analyses in progress within CLAS which have not been separately presented to the PAC.

RIGHTS and RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Thesis students can be assigned to the analysis, with notice to the Coordinating Committee, just as for any other CLAS PAC-approved experiment.
2. The proposers (spokespersons) are covered by the same "talks" policy for presentations at workshops and conferences as apply to any PAC-approved CLAS experiment.
3. The CAA will normally be approved after the first time a run group takes beam. The CAA spokespersons will have no right to specify run conditions (e.g. beam energy, target...) in any future run period.
4. Progress in a CAA must be reported to the relevant PWG's on a regular basis.

****

F. Data Calibration and Cooking

I. The responsibility for calibration and cooking of CLAS12 data rests with the Collaboration as a whole, which includes the Jefferson Lab Hall B staff and all member Institutions. Primary responsibility for calibration and cooking of a given data set rests with the Run Group which took the data. Each Run Group shall designate an Analysis Coordinator to oversee the calibration, cooking, and analysis. Primary responsibility for providing working software tools for these purposes rests with the Calibration and Commissioning (CALCOM) Group and the Software Working Group.

II. CALCOM and Software Working Groups

A. Each major software element of the off-line CLAS12 software will have a long-term employee of Jefferson Lab or a member University who has the following responsibilities:
    1. Continued improvement and maintenance of the software package.
    2. Ensuring that the software is applied properly to each data set, although the final judgment as to the validity of the output rests with the Run Groups.
    3. Training of new calibrators/cookers who wish to use the CLAS12 software.
B. A suitable person is generally NOT a short-term post-doc or graduate student, but rather someone who has a long-term position and who will likely be available for the duration of the CLAS12 program. Membership of this group can change, but the intention is that each of the senior persons have a long-term commitment to this task.
C. Each major software element should have both a person with the principal responsibility, but also a vice-principal person to help maintain and improve the codes,

documentation, and procedures. These latter persons can be at the level of post-docs and graduate students.

D. It is NOT the function of either the CALCOM or the Software Working Group to provide the manpower for running the calibration and cooking jobs. The manpower must be provided by the Run Groups.

III. Data Processing

Given the considerable resources involved, each pass of processing a Run Group data set is approved using the following procedure.

A. The Run Group completes and documents all the steps in preparation of data processing following guidelines defined by the Collaboration.
B. The readiness for data-cooking is reviewed by a committee of five members designated by the CCC. The mandate to serve in such a committee is for a minimum of two years or four reviews (renewable). No more than half of the committee can be replaced at any given time to ensure a consistency within these reviews.
C. The committee will report recommendations to the CCC. The CCC will decide upon the approval to proceed with data processing.
D. After the data cooking, the Run Group complements the documentation with all the available information for the best use and preservation of the processed data.
E. The same committee reviews the complementary documentation and reports recommendations to the CCC. The CCC will decide upon the completion of this pass of data processing.
F. Potential conflicts in the resource allocation are managed at CCC level.

IV. Governance

The Coordinating Committee will discuss progress made in CLAS calibration and cooking. In the event of scarcity of resources such as manpower or computing facilities, it is in this forum that decisions about resource allocations should be made. Service Work commitments of the Institutions can and should include providing manpower towards these needs.

****

G. Review of Proposals and Letters of Intent

The Charter Section VIII on "Run Time Proposals" does not specify the timing of the preparation of proposals or letters of intent. For effective proposal reviews, the following timeline is established:

A. The abstract of a new proposal must be communicated to the CLAS Chair at least six (6) weeks prior to the PAC deadline. A draft proposal will be made available to the CLAS chair at least four (4) weeks before the PAC submission deadline. Depending on the nature of a specific proposal (i.e. depending on the subject being within the scope of a single Working Group or not), the CLAS chair will ask one or more Physics Working Group chairs to form a committee that will be charged with reviewing the

proposal in detail. The proposal will be made available to the whole Collaboration for comment at this time.

B. The review committee will have two (2) weeks to make recommendations to the authors on the content of the proposal.
C. The review committee working with the Coordinating Committee will make a final recommendation on the proposal's endorsement by the Collaboration at least one (1) week before the PAC submission deadline.
D. The abstract of a Letter of Intent must be communicated to the CLAS chair at least two (2) weeks prior to submission to the PAC in order to inform the Collaboration of what the authors intend to undertake with CLAS. The CLAS chair will inform the Working Groups involved, and if needed will appoint a specific committee to resolve any issue that may arise.