

# HEP Response to Facilities Division COV Report 6 December 2024

Mike Procaro

Facilities Division Director  
Office of High Energy Physics  
Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy

# Introduction

- Thanks to the Committee of Visitors for their time and expertise.
  - It was a productive meeting.
- We have had draft recommendations for awhile and have started working on them.
- I will go through the recommendations and give the status of our response.
- We are putting in place procedures to ensure that our response recommendations will be tracked after my retirement.

# Recommendation 1

***“Establish a mechanism in consultation with HEPAP to advise HEP when a programmatic choice must be made that significantly deviates from the P5 plan or when the context for that choice has evolved significantly from P5 expectations.”***

- The COV report documents the history of that led to this recommendation.
  - Both the 2016 COV of the whole office and the 2020 COV of the Research Division had very similar recommendations.
  - In the HEP response to the 2020 COV we stated:

*The standard mechanism for such advice would be a request to HEPAP and/or a charge to form a subpanel to study the issue at hand. Should major programmatic choices arise which would incur a significant deviation from the P5 plan; or, if the context of such choices has evolved significantly from P5 expectations, such that further community input is desirable, the HEP Associate Director will, in consultation with NSF, recommend to the SC Director that the advice of HEPAP be sought on the matter.*

# Recommendation 2

***“Strengthen a coordination between the Facilities Division and the Research Division and factor in research and operations support when making decisions about proceeding with projects.”***

- The HEP AD has charged several working groups to bring together staff from the two divisions to work on common issues.
  - There is now a neutrino working group with staff from both divisions.
  - For the Cosmic Frontier we have formalized the already good working relationships between Facilities and Research Division staff with a working group.
  - HEP has three divisions now with the creation of the Accelerator and Technology Division.
  - The HEP AD has also created a working group with members of the Facilities Division and Accelerator Technology Division to work on issues with the Fermilab Accelerator Complex.

# Recommendation 3

***“Seek detailees or part-time consultants with specific expertise in needed areas.”***

- HEP has started the discussion on how to do this, but there are no results yet.
- We will reach out to the laboratories and ask them to identify candidates.
- The 2016 COV recommended hiring more fed staff since we were relying on detailees then.
  - We have done that successfully adding three feds to the Facilities Division since then.
- We must balance the use of feds and detailees.
  - Feds provide institutional memory and are paid by program direction funds.
  - Detailees can provide valuable expertise but are paid from program funds.

# Recommendation 4

*“Regularly solicit demographic information from the external entities including HEP project and facilities operations teams and project leaderships at national laboratories and universities and encourage project/operations leaderships to employ transparent mechanisms in allocating project/operations tasks to groups at national labs and universities.”*

- All of the labs have DEI programs and HEP relies on them to ensure a diverse workforce.
  - HEP does not want nor is allowed to micromanage personnel decisions at the labs.
  - HEP is interested that the project and operation teams are as diverse as the lab as a whole.
- We have done a first pass at soliciting demographics from labs with projects or operations programs.
  - We do not have results back from all labs yet.
- The draft report did not contain the *“employ transparent mechanisms...”* language. We could use some guidance on what the concerns are.

# Recommendation 5

## *“Recommendation 5: Create a code of conduct for the Office of High Energy Physics.”*

- HEP uses the SC code of conduct based on the APS code of conduct.
- This has been announced at Research Division reviews the past several years.
- The Facility Division has begun to also announce the code of conduct at its reviews.
  - This was initiated in May 2024 at an IPR for the LBNF/DUNE Excavation and BSI subprojects.

# Expectation for Professional Behavior

DOE Office of HEP embraces the Code of Conduct adopted by the American Physical Society

All participants, including attendees, federal staff, volunteers, vendors, and all other stakeholders will conduct themselves in a professional manner that is welcoming to all participants and free from any form of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation. Participants will treat each other with respect and consideration to create a collegial, inclusive, and professional environment. Creating a supportive environment to enable scientific discourse is the responsibility of all participants.

Participants will avoid any inappropriate actions or statements based on individual characteristics such as age, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, marital status, nationality, political affiliation, ability status, educational background, or any other characteristic protected by law. Disruptive or harassing behavior of any kind will not be tolerated. Harassment includes but is not limited to inappropriate or intimidating behavior and language, unwelcome jokes or comments, unwanted touching or attention, offensive images, photography without permission, and stalking.



# Recommendation 6

*“Investigate the possibility of establishing a “directed R&D” line to retire major technical and programmatic risks for proto-projects prior to CD-0 approval.”*

- HEP completely agrees with this recommendation.
  - We have had resistance to this approach in the past.
  - We will keep a copy of the COV report handy when people ask for CD-0.

# Recommendation 7

*“Where possible, maintain multiple sources of contracts for large projects until one particular vendor has demonstrated the capability and commitment to deliver successfully. Large contracts with industrial contractors require extra attention and should be subject to a higher level of scrutiny by Facilities Division personnel. Contracts should explicitly identify key personnel and details of the fabrication that are crucial to vendor success.”*

- HEP completely agrees with the spirit of this recommendation.
  - Procurements are inherently a laboratory responsibility.
    - The lab does have to follow DOE and federal procurement regulations.
  - HEP can ask questions about procurements, but we do **not** have authority to direct a particular procurement action.
  - Strong laboratory procurement departments are the best solution to this.

# Recommendation 8

*“Negotiate with the host lab leadership of small projects to ensure that they will have the resources they need to successfully execute the projects.”*

- HEP completely agrees with this recommendation.
  - This will be critical for the ASTAE program.

# Recommendation 9

*“Make delegation oversight to a national laboratory be at the discretion of the HEP Associate Director based on demonstrated commitment and capabilities of the laboratory.”*

- HEP completely agrees with this recommendation.
  - The Office of Project Assessment has drafted guidance that consistent with this recommendation.
  - We will continue to work with OPA on this.

# Recommendation 10

***“Recommendation 10: In cases of interagency partnerships, negotiate and document detailed arrangements between the agencies before a project gets advanced to CD-0.”***

- It is unlikely that other agencies will agree to partner before CD-0, since CD-0 represents the Department’s first commitment to pursue a project.
  - We always start discussions very early in the project but rarely before CD-0.

# Recommendation 11

*“Develop a mechanism, in collaboration with the experiments, the national labs, and international partners such as the CERN Open Data Portal, to manage data preservation after operations ends.”*

- The Office of Science has a policy on data management that includes data preservation.
  - <https://science.osti.gov/Funding-Opportunities/Digital-Data-Management>
- Much of the expertise in this area lives in the Research Division
- We will reach out to them to begin the discussion.

# Recommendation 12

*“Continue to work with Fermilab and the DOE site office to find solutions for the site access issues.”*

- Significant progress has been made, since the COV met. (See the talk by D. Glenzinski)
  - The lab has broken ground on a new welcome center that will consolidate much of the work on site access.
- HEP believes that more can be done, and we will work with the site office and the lab on this.

# Recommendation 13

*“Recommendation 13: Share best practices and lessons learned between frontiers for coordinating project, operations and research resources.”*

- HEP completely agrees with this recommendation.
  - Much of these best practices come from the Cosmic and Energy Frontiers, and we are starting to copy them to other frontiers.