

New Guidelines for the Proposal Review Committees

ESRF is equally open to applications for beam time from **academic groups, industrialists, and mixed consortia** for excellent **fundamental, applied and industrial science**.

For all such applications, the Panels should judge

- relevance, impact, innovation, potential of the scientific case presented
- and/or - relevance, impact, innovation, potential of the technological case presented
- and/or - relevance and applied importance of instrumental development
- and - quality of proposal and associated reports if appropriate

The grading scale is 0 to 5.5.

The % Assignment for each grade is given as a guideline to help the Panels to correctly distribute the scoring of their proposals for a particular round.

		<i>Guideline % Assignment</i>
5 – 5.5	Outstanding Proposal	
	Rank A*	
	The proposal is outstanding : well-written, involving innovative research into exciting science, the scientific case is compelling and the proposal is timely. A successful outcome would have a significant impact on the research field in question.	<i>up to ~5%</i>
4 - 4.9	Excellent Proposal	
	Rank A	
	Excellent proposal which is complete, scientifically compelling and timely, and should be done at the ESRF during the current proposal round.	<i>~25%</i>
3 - 3.9	Good Proposal	
	Rank B	
	A good proposal with a relevant scientific case which fully deserves beam time but is of lower priority in a competitive environment, or a potentially excellent proposal which is lacking some information, e.g. preliminary results, further explanations. In this case the Panel should specify the additional information required in the comment.	<i>~45%</i>
2 - 2.9	Sound Proposal	
	Rank C	
	The proposal is based on a sound scientific case but is considered scientifically less compelling or less timely than competing proposals, or the need for ESRF is not obvious.	<i>~25%</i>
1	Rejected Proposal	
	Rank X	
	The proposal is technically or scientifically flawed and cannot be done, or the scientific case is not worthy of synchrotron time, or the scientific case cannot be evaluated due to poor writing of the proposal.	
0	Flag proposal for discussion	

The average grade should fall in the B category and should be around 3.6 to 3.8.

In order to ensure a unified treatment of the proposals from the different committees, the following procedure should be followed:

1. The grading should be done with **one decimal point**.
2. In panels with a large number of proposals (>50), a minimum of **three reviewers** should give grades on each proposal **prior** to the meeting. The chairperson appoints the three principal reviewers; other members who feel competent are also encouraged to add their grades.
In the other committees, **every member grades all the proposals**.
3. At the meeting, the grades may need to be confirmed, if
 - (a) the discussion suggests a change
 - (b) new information is available.
4. In general, lengthy discussions should be limited to cases where
 - (a) the standard deviation on grades is large (>0.5)
 - (b) a member of the committee asks for a clarification or general discussion.
5. In case of **rejections**, the committee should give clear indications to the following questions:
 - (a) Why was the proposal rejected ?
 - (b) Is resubmission encouraged ?
6. For **all** proposals, comments from the committee are strongly encouraged in order to give useful feedback to the proposers.
7. In general, the number of shifts recommended by the beamline scientist should be respected.

At the end of the meeting, the ESRF liaison scientist in conjunction with the Chairperson should for each beamline establish a **ranking of proposals** in the categories A* to C, i.e.. A*1, A*2 ... A*n, A1, A2 ...An, B1, B2 ... Bn, C1, C2 ...Cn. No ranking is required for proposals ranked X. Note that the final numerical grading (cf.§ 3) should be retained in addition.