Don D. Reeder Spokesman --USCMS Chair -- USCMS Collaboration Board



DOE/NSF Project Review May, 1998



CMS Collaboration





US CMS Collaboration

(312 Members from 36 Institutions)

University of Alabama Boston University Brookhaven National Laboratory University of California, Davis University of California, Los Angeles University of California, Riverside University of California, San Diego **California Institute of Technology Carnegie-Mellon University Fairfield University** Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory **University of Florida Florida State University** Florida State University (SCRI) University of Illinois at Chicago **University of Iowa Iowa State University Johns Hopkins University** Los Alamos National Laboratory **University of Maryland** Massachusetts Institute of Technology **University of Minnesota University of Mississippi** University of Nebraska **Northeastern University Northwestern University University of Notre Dame Ohio State University Princeton University Purdue University Rice University University of Rochester Rutgers University University of Texas at Dallas Texas Tech University University of Wisconsin**



Demography



April 11, 1996

312 of ~2000 US Experimental Physicists



PHYSICS GOAL -detect new particles and interactions. (Higgs, SUSY, ???? signals: leptons, jets, missing energy)

- 4T Solenoidal Field
- Iron flux return to remeasure muons (Common)
- Good Tracking (E-pixels)
- Good e/γ identification and measurement (ECAL)
- Good muon identification and coverage (EMU)
- Good missing ET measurement (HCAL)



Endcap Muon	HCAL	Trigger/DAQ
Alabama UC Davis UCLA UC Riverside Carnegie Mellon Fermilab Florida Northeastern Ohio State Purdue Rice UT Dallas Wisconsin	Boston UCLA Fairfield Fermilab Florida State Illinois Chicago Iowa Iowa State Maryland Minnesota Mississippi Notre Dame Purdue Rochester Texas Tech	UC Davis UCLA UC San Diego Fermilab Iowa Iowa State MIT Mississippi Nebraska Northeastern Ohio State Wisconsin
ECAL	Tracking	Software
Brookhaven Caltech Fermilab Livermore Minnesota Northeastern Princeton	UC Davis Fermilab Florida State (SCRI) Johns Hopkins Los Alamos Mississippi Northwestern Purdue Rice Texas Tech	UC Davis UCLA UC Riverside UC San Diego Caltech Carnegie Mellon Fermilab Florida Florida State (SCRI) Johns Hopkins Maryland Northeastern



Organizational Principles

Scope:

- The CMS detector, with a CERN budget of ~400 MCHF, is a large project ---perhaps ~800M\$ by our accounting.
- Responsibility rests with the CMS Spokesman, assisted by his Deputy and several staff members; Technical Coordinator, Resource coordinator, Project Office etc.
- Still too unwieldy, so authority delegated to the individual components subject to coordination and review at the higher levels.

<u>US Perspective</u>

- to participate in frontier physics and be good stewards of the funds entrusted us, while at the same time accomodating to the overall imperatives of the larger collaboration.
- Accept responsibility in entirety for some components. Permits a semi-autonomous operation subject to US accounting and management practices and still be imbedded in the overall collaboration.



US CMS Project

Project:

- The project organization embodies line responsibility and authority and the duties and procedures are detailed in the Project Management Plan.
- •All individuals serving in management positions are appointed and serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

What's missing?

- i) An independent structure or forum for discussion of issues and concerns of the US participants regarding the Project
- ii) A means of addressing matters outside the Project scope.
- iii) A mechanism for effectively interfacing to the larger collaboration
- iv) provide information concerning the excitement and hard results of elementary particle experimentation to students and the larger community



US CMS Constitution

Membership:

• all members of the CMS collaboration from the US are members of US CMS.

Collaboration Board:

- is the primary body, composed of one representative from each US institution in CMS.
 - **1 Institution = 1 vote;** preferably by consensus, otherwise majority
- elects a Spokesperson, who also as the Chair of the CB for a 2 year term renewable.
- acts to amend and to ratify by majority vote modifications to the Constitution.

Additional members are welcome!

(No adjustment of Project funding)



Constitution II

Component Institutional Boards

- composed of the CB representatives of each institution participating in a particular component or activity.
- •A coordinator is elected for each activity to input and act for the collaboration on matters concerning their activity.(2-year term)

Executive Board

- composed of the component or activity coordinators, *ex officio* the TD and the CPM and is chaired by the Spokesperson.
- together with the Spokesperson, the EB is responsible for the those issues beyond the scope of the Project.

Duties of the Spokesperson

- •Represent the interests of the US members within CMS
- •Organize and chair meetings of the CB and EB.
- Conduct elections of the Coordinators.





Beyond the Project

• <u>Need to segue seamlessly from Project to Experiment</u>

Among the requirements are:

- large volume, rapid and secure communication and data transfer.
- ability to participate in the analysis in an active and timely fashion
- meet our responsibility for operation and maintenance of our components.
- to communicate the progress and results both within the HEP community and to the larger lay community.

How?

- state-of-the-art networking facility (ESNET progeny?)
- timely acquisition of computing, data storage and software
- ramp up the pre-op activities as the project winds down (a rough estimate of the costs for this is ~ 9M\$ annually at completion of the ramp-up.)
- education and outreach activity with sufficient resources. (people + \$)