

Dear Katsuyuki,

Attached you find our budget form. I would like to further describe the present status of this “project”.

The challenge is to find/create a conference platform that allows for presentation, discussions, mingling and posters (and potentially exhibitors). We are at present looking into the platform “wonder.me”. In principle it can give us a suitable solution for free(!) but, after some tests, we are worried about its stability. We are now looking into solutions to make it more stable, and are open for setting it up on a separate server, if the owner of the platform allow it. Another issue is that Wonder.me does not allow for separate logins for each participant, something we hope to solve by arranging a software “shell” around it. A fallback solution is to use, e.g. Zoom, but it lacks the desired functions for social interactions that we think is essential for a workshop. To support us in finding and adopting a suitable solution we have engaged Fredrik Löfgren. He has already arranged several small online conferences. See the following article (in Swedish only I’m afraid): <https://liu.se/nyhet/vad-ar-val-zoom-mot-virtual-reality-> Our demands are however different (we don’t want to need to use VR-goggles), and he has agreed to work with us for a fixed fee.

I guess you now understand that it is not easy to set a correct budget today. However, we are willing to take the risk and use our own funding if needed. If we turn out to be very successful and we make a profit, the funds given by IUVSTA will be returned.

Best regards,

Ulf

From Marcelo,

the subject is pertinent and is well known the apparent conflicts on the field, it is a good moment to do a workshop on that,

- the VSTD has a strong interface and interest on this subject since it is used within specific vacuum applications, a co-sponsoring from VSTD is possible,

Questions

It is noted the organizers proponents of the workshop are the same of the underwriting company supporting of the event.

- Can the workshop be seen as an indirect support for a specific commercial entity?
- How we could be sure the invited speakers represent a wide perspective of the field?

From Anouk

true that the situation is a little bit unclear, especially as I am not sure it is proposed by the Swedish Vac Soc, but maybe it is.

First of all, 3 half days are not in agreement with a WS, in addition, that sounds very difficult for me to have 18 speakers!

Would it be possible to ask them to change it to a short course proposal for a grant of 2000 euros ?
Anyway, a few ethical questions are raised indeed, it would be better that the Swedish Vac Soc is endorsing, the risk sounds quite low.

From Ivan

Let me add my perspective on this workshop. I have been involved in it from the conception. Ulf is the Swedish representative in the Surface Engineering Division. I have been acting as a member of the program committee in defining the topic and selecting the speakers. As Ulf mentions, a quarter of the invited speakers have been asked for suggestions, and that is how we determined the list in the proposal.

This list is work in progress – it can be improved. If this workshop is supported by other IUVSTA divisions, they can propose names.

This is a true workshop, not a short course. There have been significant developments in HIPIMS – bipolar, metal-ion assisted HIPIMS films growth, reactive HIPIMS. We need the leading expert in these hot areas to have a discussion.

On-line workshops are novelty in all aspects. We cannot strictly apply the old metrics (e.g.4-5 days). Any online conference is much shorter, much denser. So three days and a limited number of the top speakers seems to us as a manageable on-line workshop.

As far as guaranteeing that no conflict of interest exist – we have two avenues. First the proposal should have been submitted by me as a chair of the SED. But Ulf followed the instructions to the division Chairs, and submitted it directly to STD leadership, noting that it has been coordinated with me. We did discuss if I should be in the organizing committee, but since Ulf is a member of the IUVSTA SED (which is a requirement) have two members (me and Ulf) seemed superfluous. I could be added as a co-chair and I will guarantee that no commercial interests have influence in any aspect.

Secondly, we can ask Ulf to have the financial underwriting by the Swedish Vacuum Society.

Lastly, we could limit the support to \$2k, because asking for \$1.5 K for unclear platform modifications seems too much. In my view, online forums should be much cheaper.

However, I do believe that this should be an IUVSTA workshop, because the first and only HIPIMS IUVSTA workshop was in 2008 and there is a need for new one.

From Anouk,

This information will probably have to be transmitted to the STD, it is of course convincing in a moving context.

3 comments: 1. there is no problem of money, the budget must be sincere but this was not the question, 2. no problem as regards the scientific topic, 3. maybe more a problem of format and process (to my understanding the proposals come from the member societies not from division chairs).

Everything can probably be overcome, including the fact that money could be more easily transmitted to a non-profit association than a company.

As regards formats defined in our Handbook, why not introducing flexibility for virtual meetings? Christoph may have to propose changes to adapt to this new way of meetings.

From Marcello

Thanks a lot for your time answering my questions! You made it very clear how the motivations and

preparations were made.

I agree, the format of a virtual workshop need to be organized in detail. I had already participated on a dozen and the results are quite spread in between excellent and poor. My only comment (I wouldn't call even suggestion) the correct tool and agenda are dependent strongly on the participants background on virtual meetings. I think this came directly from our local experience, what can be quite distinct. Clear descriptions of the arrangements and expect "behavior" during the event helped to make some events better.

If possible, I would like to see some comments from the organizers on the preparation and on the evolution of the event/interactions as part of the final report. It could offer to IUVSTA as institution some base for future virtual meetings guideline.

From Ivan

Just a quick note on you comment "As regards formats defined in our Handbook, why not introducing flexibility for virtual meetings?" and the need to adapt it.

The language now is "They(workshops) will normally last 4-6 days."

To me this is a recommendation, not an absolute rule.

If we had written "They SHALL last 4-6 days" or "They MUST last 4-6 days" then there can be exception to 3 or 7 days.

The word "normally" opens the possibility of having a three day workshop, especially under the unusual circumstances of a pandemic.

I also agree that we might try to issue some guidance for on-line workshops, schools, TTC, conferences etc, but we will get that experience when we actually conduce a few.

From Anouk

I think we all agree on the needs to have some changes in our "recommandations" if you like, because in many cases in the past, we refused longer short courses because they were.... too long, or short WS, because... they were too short.

Here in the context, it may be quite odd to refuse to open our rules, but now, it comes that we will have a proposal for a 4 half-day short course and a 3 half-day WS.

We should take the "spirit" of the scientific meeting, more than the length, but, and it is not the case here at all as I already said, the budget request to IUVSTA should be really proportionnal.

So maybe a frame for defining the spirit of the event, for budgeting a reasonable amount for fully virtual events (cost of microphones if necessary, on-line tool, electronic tablets if necessary ...), and additionnally, we should send a form at the end of the event, especially the 100% virtual ones but not only, to get a realistic feed-back on this new way of meeting.

Christoph may open the question in a statute committee during next ECM, we should have time for it.

Of course, it is good that we can discuss this in advance with the help of the transmission of the applications from Katsuyuki and Jay, it helps a lot for the D-Day discussions.

From Ana,

Comments:

- The subject is relevant. Although the subject is not fully in line with NSD division topics, a co-sponsoring from NSD division is possible since NSD division supports and encourage scientific meetings (workshops, schools, conferences, ...) if subjects are relevant and important/interesting.

Remarks:

-The head of the budget sheet is from 2016 (2016. 10. 24-28).

- Gender balance: as far as I could understand among 18 invited speakers only - 1 - is female (maybe 2).

- It is mentioned an exhibitor fee of 200 Euro. Considering the 5-10 expected exhibitors : 1000 €-2000 € Although, this income is not considered in the total income.

From Jay

All, I've been following the discussion....and here is my 2 cents on the "general" issue

For the immediate ECM133 I think we need a certain amount of flexibility in how we read the rules of WS,SCH,SC, and TTC's. It is clear that the rules were written for "Brick-and-Mortar/Face-to-Face" meeting events. We are now adapting to electronic/virtual/distance learning formats.

Idea: While likely beyond the scale of what can be accomplished at the upcoming ECM, we could consider a brief set of "guidelines" for "electronic/virtual/distance learning" versions such as eWS, eSCH, eSC, and eTTC's that we can work with

From Anouk

Of course we can be flexible, I will also suggest an special Covid expense in the Finance committee for the Hungarian colleagues facing in September the turn of ICTF into 100% virtual, but the point is to be fair: if the flexibility was known before by other societies, they may have proposed their bid also. So we can adapt (by the way, an on-line system as ZOOM is 16 euros for 1 month not 1500 euros, but they have to explain what they call "platform"), but ask for reasonable conditions.

From Dmitri

The topic of the proposed workshop is quite far from the BID core topics.

On the logistics, this is a proposal for a new model of how to do a virtual workshop and how to arrange the financial aspects. I don't think that there is a uniform understanding of how to best organize such events, but I expect that we will have a discussion of this issue during the ECM and share good or bad experiences encountered so far this year.

From Leszek

I asked the ASSD members about their opinion on the submitted workshop proposal, as requested. All feedbacks expressed their will to support the proposed workshop.

However, in the most of responses their authors drawn attention to insufficient diversity in the list of invitees, in terms of gender but also in terms of nationalities (no invitees from the Americas, the Middle East etc), following the line that Anouk included in her Statement on the IUVSTA website:

‘Last but not least, IUVSTA has to defend diversity in scientific carriers of all types and I would like us to monitor, with company and academic partners, gender fair practices in our Conferences’,

Thus, the ASSD encourages the organisers to include more women in their list of (potential) invited speakers, at least.