

PHASE III Beamline Evaluation AGENDA

16 July 2014 – Beamline (BL) proposers informed about evaluation criteria and evaluation procedure schedule

31 August 2014 – BL spokespersons propose two referee names for the corresponding project

15 September 2014 – The SAC Chair in consultation with ALBA appoints a representative person from within SAC for each proposal. Each of these people will invite two referees for their respective proposal including only one from the list suggested by the proposers

30 September 2014 – Referees list completed

15 October 2014 – BL Proposals submitted to SAC members and to external referees, through a dedicated web application in ALBA webpage, as pdf files.

15 November 2014 – Referees reports submitted to SAC and to proposal spokespersons

3-4 December 2014 – SAC Meeting at ALBA (the AUSE representative will attend the meeting and participate in the discussion, but not in the definition of the final ranking).

3 December 2014 - Open session: one hour per proposal, including presentation plus discussion. Proposers can incorporate their comments to referees' reports in their presentations.

4 December 2014 – SAC Closed session. The evaluation of the Phase III Beamline will be presented to ALBA management.

End 2014 – ALBA publishes the Phase III Beamline ranking, based on SAC recommendations and internal considerations.

Evaluation Criteria and Final Scoring

The evaluation criteria are grouped into three main categories: scientific case, user community and technical proposal, which will be independently evaluated, weighting 50, 25 and 25% respectively. In the following the three categories are expanded in sub-criteria, which can be used as a guideline for the proposals and presentations.

Scientific Case

- Strength of the scientific case
- Innovation contents, added value with respect to similar facilities
- Possibility of high-impact publications

User Community

- AUSE – Spanish community support
- International community support or foreseen interest
- Industrial users
- Training of young scientists

Technical Proposal

- Feasibility
- Maturity of the project
- Compatibility and synergy with the machine
- Synergy with existing ALBA expertise
- Cost and cost benefit

The scores for each assessment category are only a guide to the final overall judgment, which will summarize all relevant considerations. The final recommendation from the SAC will follow the following classification (with internal ranking if applicable):

A: should be considered for funding now if resources are available in Phase III;

B: should not be considered for funding in Phase III. The scientific case is strong enough so that a new proposal could be considered in the future if modified appropriately;

C: the proposal is deemed not feasible for technical reasons at the current time;

D: should not be considered for funding in Phase III and the scientific case does not warrant consideration in the near future round of proposals.

SAC Members (as proposed to Consejo Rector) - 2014

- John Helliwell, Manchester University, chair
- Oliver Bunk, PSI
- Andrew Fitch, ESRF
- Peter Guttman, HZB - BESSY II
- Andreas Jankowiak, HZB
- Amor Nadji, SOLEIL
- Jose Enrique Ortega, University of the Basque Country *San Sebastian*
- Sakura Pascarelli, ESRF
- Ian Robinson, London Centre for Nanotechnology
- Nick Terrill, Diamond
- Mari Cruz Garcia, AUSE Observer

One expert will be coopted for SKIRON evaluation.