

Subcommittee Chairperson

Terms of reference

June.2023: Modified by SCO

12.February.2026: Modified by SCC

1. Before the Subcommittees meeting

1.1. Review of the proposals

All the Subcommittee members have access to the proposals submitted to their college on their own User Club account (<https://userclub.ill.eu/userclub/>) once they have logged in. (approximately ten days after the deadline for proposal submission).

You will select (with the help of the college secretary) one to two referees amongst the members for each proposal, according to their field of expertise. Each referee is required to carefully read the assigned proposals and to report on them during the subcommittee meeting.

Please note, that you might also be asked to review non-standard proposal for which the process deviates from what is written below. If you are unsure with the handling of a non-standard proposal, the college secretary or SCO can clarify.

1.2. Grading of proposals

All proposals in your subcommittee should be graded from 1 to 10 with 10 being the best. Grading lists are made available by SCO on a secured page of the ILL web to all subcommittee members. All the subcommittee members should fill in the list, by giving a note to each proposal and send the list back to the college secretary before the deadline. They all have also the possibility to enter their grades in the appropriate web interface on the User Club.

1.3. New, continuation and resubmitted proposals

Please note that the ILL wishes to encourage new Users.

For continuation proposals, an experimental report must be attached. The lack of an experimental report for a continuation proposal may be a reason for rejection.

In case of resubmission, please check with the college secretary the reasons for rejection before the subcommittee meeting. Failing to address the panel's recommendations may be a reason for further rejection.

All information concerning submitted proposals should remain confidential.

2. During the Subcommittees meeting

2.1. Grading of proposals

SCO will prepare a pro-rata sheet, containing the instrument request and beamtime availability for each college.

The final outcome of the subcommittee meeting should be a list of A-graded proposals that should be given beamtime, a list of C-graded proposals that should not be given beamtime and a list of B-graded proposals that will be given the remaining beamtime as long as there is time available:

- A proposal ($7 < \text{grade} \leq 10$)
- B proposal ($4 < \text{grade} \leq 7$)
- C proposal ($\text{grade} \leq 4$)

After having given beamtime to the A proposals, the B proposals should be ranked in order when allocating beamtime, using no more than one decimal place. The ranking should be done by instrument and not by list of all proposals in the subcommittee, but. The cut-off grade for beamtime allocation may vary between instruments according to the instrument demand.

Please note that - due to the relatively high overload on the majority of the instruments – not all proposals can get beamtime, therefore you should make sure that not all proposals are rated A-proposal. No more than approximately 70% of the total allocated beamtime should go to A-graded proposals.

You must give reasons for the refusal for all those proposals which have not obtained beamtime. SCO provides you with a list of the more frequent standard comments. You may wish to add more specific comments to some proposals, and even suggestions/remarks to some proposals which obtained beamtime. Especially for rejected proposals, it is important for the feedback to be clear and constructive.

You may be asked to discuss particular topics of relevance for the ILL within the subcommittee meeting, and you should report about them to the Scientific Council after the subcommittee. You will receive a note from the Science Division Director, just before the meeting, specifying the items to be discussed.

2.2. Attribution of beamtime from the pool

In some cases, for some instruments, spare beamtime is available for all colleges (spare time is indicated on the pro-rata sheet). You have the possibility to bid for this extra beamtime allocation during the discussion (pool meeting) which takes place at the end of Wednesday afternoon. When pool time is available for a given instrument, you may ask to give it to a proposal which has not received time in your college (you will be asked to make a short statement to describe the proposal, and give reasons for allocation). The final decision for the pool time allocation is up to the Science Division Director.

2.3. Scientific Council

The Scientific Council (SC) starts the following morning shortly after the pool meeting. Chairpersons are invited to participate and to present a short oral report (no longer than 10 min) of their Subcommittee meeting.

In order to reduce your efforts for the preparation of your report, the Scientific Council has defined some important items that you are kindly asked to consider in your short review:

- Demand
 - Absolute number of proposals and its variation with respect to the previous round
 - Fraction of A-, B-, C-proposals, distribution of beam time between A- and B-proposals
 - Are there unusual overload factors (for specific instruments)?
- User community
 - Are there dominating groups or new user groups?
- Science
 - New trends and disciplines?
 - One or two scientific highlights
- Recommendations
 - Are there particular problems encountered with individual instruments?
 - Are there other problems or risks concerning sample environment, infrastructure etc.?
 - Are there any other suggestions arising from the proposal round?

A template for your report will be made available before the meeting.

The SC much appreciates all the work you put into the operation of the subcommittee. The chair of the SC would welcome (a few months in advance of any SC meeting) any suggestions for items to be included in the formal agenda of the next SC meeting.

3. After the Subcommittees meeting

You are asked to prepare a more exhaustive and detailed written report on the Subcommittee meeting and to send it to the Science Division Director. The deadline is usually one week after the subcommittee. The report usually contains comments specific to the subcommittee meeting (overall quality of the proposals, % of accepted/refused, topics survey, highlights, scientific trends, new users, ...), but you may include more general comments and your views on different subjects.

4. Long Term Proposals

The ILL allows users from its member countries to apply for long-term beamtime, by submitting a Long Term Proposal (LTP), usually at the September deadline.

The LTP will undergo internal and external evaluation procedures, the internal evaluation being performed by ILL staff (such as instrument responsible(s), requested support service responsible(s) and safety officers), and the external carried out by competent people in the concerned Subcommittee. As a chair, you will be asked to be involved in this process. For more detailed guidelines see

<http://www.ill.eu/users/applying-for-beamtime/long-term-proposal/>