

There are clearly significant scientific and strategic benefits of bringing our groups together to form a unified collaboration on the topic of GPDs. However, to help ensure we can build a unified team that can work together toward a very strong proposal, and then deliver on its objectives if funded, we think we must first reach agreement on some key points. These points focus on management structures, funding priorities, and science focus areas:

1. **Steering Committee:** The current Coordination Committee, which consists of four “JLab members” (Christian, David, Ian, and Martha) and four “LBL members” (Feng, Ismail, Phiala, and Xiangdong), will transition to the Steering Committee (SC) and be responsible for managing the proposal preparation process (e.g., writing, designing management structure, etc.), which will be done in open consultation with the entire collaboration. This committee will remain in place until the submission of the proposal, and if a replacement committee member is needed this person will be chosen by the remaining members of the original “Lab” group. The proposal should clearly describe the management structure that will be adopted if funding is forthcoming, and this structure should have no reference to these original Lab groups.
2. **Bridge positions:** The collaboration agrees to fund at least two bridge positions if this opportunity is possible. Priority for funding these bridge positions should be given to those institutions that increase the diversity of our field, as such, we think Hampton University is an ideal target for funding, with any subsequent choices decided by a vote of the collaboration. Note, to demonstrate a credible bridge position in the proposal we should have a signed letter from the Dean.
3. **Lead Institution:** The SC will solicit nominations for the Lead Institution (LI) and the various options for LI will be openly discussed by the entire collaboration. The SC will develop a process for deciding on the LI in consultation with the entire collaboration. Important factors to consider include overhead rates, ability of the institution to process funds efficiently, and diversity of leadership.
4. **Management structure:** We are proposing a large theory collaboration and therefore a commensurate management structure is needed. We suggest a funded proposal should be managed by a steering committee consisting of the PI, the three focus area leads (see below), and an additional three members from the collaboration. This steering committee should have a diversity of people and institutions, and provide opportunities for early career staff to serve.
5. **Meetings:** The proposal will budget for workshops, collaboration meetings, and graduate schools. Preference for support to attend these meetings will be given to students, postdocs, and early career staff.
6. **Matching funds:** The postdocs and graduate students that are supported by this topical collaboration should be funded at 50%, the remainder of the funds should be provided by the host institution. In choosing which institutions should receive funding the main consideration should be the science needs of the project, with an emphasis on supporting early career staff and creating a diverse team of people and institutions.

7. **Focus areas:** The proposal has three main focus areas: theory, lattice QCD, and global analysis. After funding the bridge positions and meetings, the remaining funds should, to a good approximation, be evenly split between these focus areas. With possible adjustments driven by the science and the overall success of the TC. The distribution of funds within a focus area should be largely decided by its members, where for this purpose each collaboration member should formally be part of just one focus area, however, they can of course contribute to all areas of the collaboration. Each focus area should have a lead. [To reduce the administrative burden on collaboration members and leadership, there is a strong desire to not have this TC act like a funding agency.]
8. **New members:** During the proposal preparation process the collaboration should be open to accepting new members. Priority for membership should be given to those that strengthen the science, and broaden the diversity of people and institutions in the collaboration. The SC will develop a process for accepting new members, which should likely include a majority vote of the SC in favor of membership. A similar process should be outlined in the proposal.
9. **Ethics guidelines:** If funded, the TC should develop ethic guidelines or a code of conduct around scientific integrity, conduct at meetings, etc. This can largely be adopted from existing policies at the APS, INT, etc. These policies should be discussed openly by the collaboration and adopted by a vote of the whole collaboration. This process should be outlined in the proposal.
10. **Amendments:** Significant changes to these key points can be made by a vote of the SC, where at least a 75% majority vote in favor must be achieved to enact a change.

— OLD BULLETS

1. **Lead Institution:** The SC will solicit nominations for the Lead Institution (LI) and the various options for LI will be openly discussed by the entire collaboration. Important factors to consider will be overhead rates, ability of the institution to process funds efficiently, and diversity of leadership. The LI will be decided by a vote of the entire collaboration.
2. **Spokespersons:** There should be two overall spokespersons for the project. One will be associated with the lead institution, as discussed [above](#). The other will be decided collectively, as for the lead PI below, to ensure both physics and demographic diversity? [AA: “lead PI above” → “lead PI”; remove question mark at the end.](#)
3. Coordination committee will transition to the steering committee with the same members until the submission of the proposal.

Steering committee (?)

The collaboration is very strong, but there are others we are in discussions with collaborators, as are you, whom we believe would strengthen our joint effort. As part of a successful proposal, we will have to put in place a management structure, and that will be an important task of this committee. **DGR:** I think this actually is similar to Andreas' comments. **Alberto:** a top-down approach is not accepted, should be a hub for networking. **(MC:** This is an important point.)

Peter: I would suggest to avoid bringing up "elections" which requires to define who has "voting rights" ...

Spokesperson

DGR: There should be two overall spokespersons for the project. One will be associated with the lead institution, as discussed below. The other will be decided collectively, as for the lead PI below, to ensure both physics and demographic diversity?

(MC: Any criteria you want to be considered for this selection?)

Bridge positions - Lead Institution

The commitment of bridge positions will be an important component in the assessment of the project. Likewise, the need for diversity and inclusion, and the representation of under-represented communities, will likewise be important. The overall project, and the structure that is put in place, should reflect their importance. **(MC:** A written support from the Dean is imperative for a bridge position to be considered.)

(MC: The lead institution should be decided collectively and each institution can present their proposal. The cost of processing fees for sub-contracts and the support of the institution to smoothly distribute the funds in a timely manner are very important. The goal is to maximize the funds allocated to research.)

Resources distribution (co-PIs ?)

There is a desire to avoid the collaboration playing the role of a funding agency. Rather than the coordinating committee requesting proposals, it would be better were it to assign the resources in each of the three thrusts - theory, lattice, and phenomenology/analysis (roughly 150K per year per area) as a collaborative process. We anticipate the coordinating committee members across these areas to reach out to colleagues in the collaboration to accomplish this task, making sure that any assignment is commensurate both with the effort and the importance to the overall project. **DGR:** Do these encompass Kostas' concerns below?

Kostas: Resources should be distributed to both groups that are appropriate for the level of effort in the project

Peter: two suggestions for bullets (formulations may need improvement):

- **It is important to remain inclusive and welcome (during LOI/proposal writing stage) new members who are interested and strengthen the physics case.**

(This will help to secure community support which is instrumental for the success. It will leave the door open for Simonetta Liuti, Aurore Courtoy, Susan Gardner, Matthias Burkardt, Michael Engelhardt and others who are not part of the merging groups at this point. In my opinion, the best way to study exclusive reactions, is to be inclusive.)

- **When distributing funds, the needs of junior colleagues who face career-decisive evaluations should be taken into consideration.**

(I am not saying, senior collaborators should get nothing. But we should keep in mind the future of the field, and support junior colleagues by (i) making them full members of the Topical Collaboration, and (ii) making funds available to them.)