

DISCUSSION WITH IN2P3/INP REPRESENTATIVES AT GDR-InF ANNUAL MEETING 2020

1. In the latest years IN2P3 promoted the emergence of GDRs, animating the French physics communities working on different topics. What is the point of view of IN2P3 and INP about the role of the GDRs? Which are the expectations from the institutes? Do you believe that GDRs are filling their mission as expected? Do you have additional indications?
2. Considering the exciting time in intensity frontier physics, and the very interesting perspectives, we wish to play a major role in the upcoming projects. Building ambitious programs is crucial to keep the interest and involvement of the community. Which level of support could we expect from the IN2P3? Which are your indications and suggestions to succeed?
3. Sometimes technical developments are blocked by the lack of engineering resources. As a consequence, sometimes we miss the opportunity of taking leading roles in the collaboration (for example, for building a sub-detector). The impression is that abroad there is a process of decision which is quicker, and a larger availability of technical resources. Can you comment on this?
4. We realise within the GDR-InF how crucial is the interplay between theorists and experimentalists. How the place of particle physics theorists is expected to evolve in the coming years at INP and IN2P3?
5. In our GDR-InF we have enthusiastic young researchers, students and postdocs, who are willing to continue in the research field. They are crucial for the progress of the discipline. There is no doubt that some are discouraged and see only few opportunities to have a position. How do you expect the situation to evolve in the coming years? Which are your suggestions for them?

6. At several institutions outside France, particularly in theory, postdocs are chosen not to work on a particular project, leaving a lot of room for creativity, spontaneity and the development of independence. This is (almost) impossible in France and has a negative impact on research here. Is there any way to put something like this in place? Could the money used for inviting senior researchers to visit our labs be used for younger researchers, either short term visits or postdocs?
7. ANR/ERC projects take time and energy to be built up. The good aspect is that sometimes they allow putting in place a structured collaboration among different physicists and laboratories, with detailed task planning. Unfortunately, even despite very good feedback from ANR/ERC reviewers, their funding is apparently limited and so some projects are excluded. In addition, for ANR it seems that the committee, despite recognizing the validity of proposals concerning large collaboration experiments, is not willing to finance projects which are expected to be supported by the institutes.
 - a. Can we hope that IN2P3/INP take into consideration supporting these structured projects in a different way?
 - b. Can IN2P3/INP have some weight in explaining why it makes sense to support projects concerning large collaborations?
8. The “Prospectives 2020” workshop is delayed by about 6 months. Can we have some early feed-back regarding intensity frontier physics?

MORE BROAD QUESTIONS (coming from a coffee discussion during the meeting) THAT WE WISH TO RAISE TO YOUR ATTENTION

9. Which is the status of the implementation at IN2P3 and INP of the “Plan d’action égalité professionnelle entre les femmes et les hommes au CNRS”

<https://mpdf.cnrs.fr/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/planegalite.pdf>? We are wondering if actions are foreseen, just to make a few examples, to help parents with childcare during missions, or with regular interviews to discuss career development with all staff.

10. Some laboratories have put in place a “Diversity correspondent”. Some have also an “eco-responsibility correspondent”. Would it make sense that IN2P3 and INP invite to have these representatives in all laboratories and eventually provide them some training?