

Minutes Contact person meetings, Tuesday January 17  
and Thursday January 19, 2006, CERN, Geneva,  
Switzerland.

**Participants:** Riccardo Argurio (UL Brussels), Ioannis Bakas (Patras), Matthias Blau (Neuchâtel), Anna Ceresole (U. Piemonte Or.), Jean-Pierre Derendinger (Neuchâtel), Bernard de Wit (Utrecht), Uegen Diaconu (Craiova), Paolo Di Vecchia (NORDITA), Sergio Ferrara (Frasacati), Pietro Frè (Torino), Matthias Gaberdiel (ETH Zurich), Roberto Iengo (SISSA), Elias Kiritsis (Ecole polytechnique), Costas Kounnas (ENS-Paris), Alberto Lerda (Alessandria), Maria Lledo (Valencia & representing Barcelona), Yolanda Lozano (Oviedo), Dieter Lüst (coordinator, München, chairs second meeting), Emil Nissimov (Sofia), Thomas Ortin (Madrid), Silvia Penati (Milano Bicocca), Marios Petropoulos (Ecole polytechnique), Franco Pezzella (Napoli), Alfonso Ramallo (Santiago), Alexander Sevrin (secretary, VU Brussels), Dimitri Sorokin (Padova), Kelly Stelle (Imperial C. London), Larus Thorlacius (Iceland), Stefan Vandoren (Utrecht), Toine Van Proeyen (Leuven, chairs first meeting), Alberto Zaffaroni (Milano Bicocca), Daniela Zanon (Milano I),

Most absent contact persons apologized.

## 1 Meeting I: post-doc selection, chair: Toine Van Proeyen

There were 207 candidates this year. The application procedure covers positions financed by the network as well as positions supported by other sources.

### 1.1 General remarks

It is clear that many universities from the US as well as from Europe make their offers earlier and earlier. There is a consensus that our yearly post-doc meeting should be held earlier as well. From now on the post-doc meeting will be separated from the school. The meeting will be held in December, before Christmas in a central, easily reachable location (Brussels/Leuven or perhaps Paris).

Another remark concerns the webbased application. According to several readers we should give the candidate the opportunity to submit a detailed research proposal. In addition it would be useful if the candidates could submit the list of invited talks he/she gave.

We could also think of polling the candidates (using *e.g.* the questionnaire at the school) what the candidates themselves think of the webbased application and whether they have any further suggestions.

## 1.2 Procedure

There were twelve readers (Belluci, Bergshoeff, Blau, Deneff, Fré, Nekrasov, Obers, Stelle, Penati, Petropoulos, Vandoren, Van Hove) each of whom studied 33–35 file such that every file was reviewed by two readers. Candidates having letters of recommendation from the same person were put – as far as possible – into the same pool. Each file was scored by the readers (1,2 or 3). The scores used throughout the procedure were:

- 1 Not to be considered.
- 2 Good candidate.
- 3 We should give the candidate a job.
- 5 Has an offer from our network.
- 8 The candidate accepted a job outside our network.
- 9 The candidate accepted a job inside our network.

About half of the candidates got weak marks by the readers. During the meeting their names are read. If nobody objects, they are not further considered, *i.e.* they get a 1. When someone does object they are added to the list of candidates who will be thoroughly discussed. The remaining candidates are then considered in detail and they are given a score of 2 or 3.

## 1.3 result

During the meeting 17 candidates were classified with a score of 3 (“must take”) and 44 got a score of 2. At that point there were already 14 candidates falling into category 9 (accepted a job inside the network) and 27 in category

8 (accepted job elsewhere). Beginning of February, there were 5 people who received a score of 3 left without an offer. The number of people in category 9 was then 30.

Toine handles all the correspondence with the candidates. Once the procedure comes to its end, Toine will send a letter to the unsuccessful candidates as well. Thanks Toine for the great job!

## 2 Meeting II, chair: Dieter Lüst

### 2.1 Reporting

Each node is requested to send for each of its past, present or future (if known) hirings (both ER and ESR, but only those positions financed by the network), the following information to Dieter (even if you did already so on other occasions):

- Name and date of birth
- Dates of start and end of the period he/she was financed by the network.
- Nationality
- Year when PhD was obtained (only for ER obviously)

This information will be used to make an evaluation of the present status of hirings viz. the EC rules (e.g. we are only allowed to spend at most 30% of our budget to non-EC/non-associate memberstate ER's or ESR's, we need to get a view on how well the hiring of ESR's is running, etc.). Deadline for this: **March 31, 2006!**

**Reminder: when you hire an ER or ESR, please check the rules and make sure your candidate is eligible! Every hiring entails a lot of paperwork such as a career development plan, time sheets, declaration of conformity, ... You find the rules at the end of the network webpage in the (password protected) section for contact persons.**

## 2.2 The next workshop(s)

Dieter requests that the next workshop will not be held in September but in October. Several possible locations were discussed<sup>1</sup>, however there was consensus on Napoli (thanks to the swift initiative of Franco Pezzella). It will be held in Napoli from October 9 through October 13, 2006. Registration is already possible at <http://wsrtn06.na.infn.it/> . Please register and take care of your accommodation as early as possible as Napoli is a very touristic city and rooms are in great demand. Note that this is the mid-term meeting! This means that participation of all the contact persons and researchers paid by the network is required!

Marian Lledó proposes Valencia for the 2007 workshop, an idea favorably received by everyone.

Matthias Gaberdiel proposes Zürich as a potential candidate for the 2008 workshop. This is tentative as he first needs to check whether this is practically feasible. Furthermore we were reminded that at the administrative meeting at München, Bulgaria proposed to organize the workshop at some point as a part of a larger school/series of meetings.

## 2.3 The present and future schools

### 2.3.1 The present school

There were 254 registered participants. Together with the local people this meant that the main auditorium was sometimes almost completely filled!

The scientific part of the school is generally perceived as truly excellent, this holds especially for the lecture series. The working groups need some rethinking to keep it small scale and intensive. The people in the network who got the responsibility for the working groups should work on it.

The non-scientific part receives mild criticisms. The absence of name badges, the fact that there was no welcoming reception, ... causes young people to drown in the huge structure that CERN is.

---

<sup>1</sup>Among them Madrid was seriously discussed but there were two constraints: they are already quite busy with the organization of Strings 2007 and it turns out to be rather prohibitively expensive as well. As a consequence the idea was discarded.

### **2.3.2 Future schools**

CERN offered to host, co-organize and cofinance the school both in 2007 and in 2008. After some discussion, this was indeed decided. Thanks to the people of the CERN Particle Theory Group! However, the previous remarks should be taken into account (which is not really a problem).

### **2.3.3 Varia**

There are numerous small (or not so small) meetings, lecture series, ... in various nodes of our network. They are posted on the webpage of the network. Check it regularly!