 <b>CLPU</b> CENTRO DE LÁSERES PULSADOS	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 1 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

---

# Access Committee Guidelines and Rules

---

- 1 Objectives and scope of application
- 2 Reference documentation
- 3 Definitions
- 4 Description
  - 4.1 Selection of members
  - 4.2 Appointments and renewals
  - 4.3 Composition of the Committee in each call
  - 4.4 Functions
  - 4.5 Basic principles of action
  - 4.6 General evaluation criteria
  - 4.7 Action procedure
  - 4.8 Funding of the Access Committee: Fees and Expenses
- 5 Annexes
  - 5.1 Individual Referee Report
  - 5.2 Access Committee Report


<b>Prepared</b> 	<b>Reviewed</b> 	<b>Approved</b> 
Process Officer	Director Managing Director	Executive Commission (Approved in Ordinary Meeting March 28th, 2017)

CHANGE CONTROL				
EDITION/ REVISION	REVISION DATE	DATE OF EFFECTIVENESS	NAME AND SIGNATURE	OBSERVATIONS (Changes made)
Ed. 1 Rev. 0				

COPY DISTRIBUTION	Rank								
	Date								
	Signature								

The above signatories, as holders of a copy of the following procedure, commit themselves to:

- 1) Its custody, proper use and care.
- 2) Updating the procedure, by addition or substitution of corrections or amendments performed, proceeding to their immediate application as well as communicating any necessary instruction about the procedure to the staff under their leadership.
- 3) Respect the obligation of professional secrecy about the use of this information, by not disclosing or conveying it by any means (photocopies, electronic format or others) to third parties without the specific permission of the Direction.
- 4) Avoid any activity or actuation that goes against the legal or economic interests of the **CLPU**.

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 3 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

## 1 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF APPLICATION

- 1.1 The aim of this document is to depict the composition, principles of action and internal procedures of the Access Committee of the CLPU.
- 1.2 This procedure will apply to every member of the Access Committee.

## 2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTATION


- Resolution of September 30th, 2008 of the State Secretariat for Research, Development and Innovation, through which a specific agreement collaboration between the Ministry of Education and Science, the Community of Castile and Leon and the University of Salamanca is published to create the consortium to build, equip and exploit the Spanish Pulsed Lasers Center<sup>1</sup>
- System and Equipment Access Policy of the CLPU
- Scientific Program of the CLPU
- Access Procedure for the Vega Laser System
- Appointment of members of the Access Committee
- FARO application management software Manual - Competitive Access (Call for Proposals) for VEGA

## 3 DEFINICIONES

- 3.1 **Access Committee:** Independent advisory body in charge of the evaluation of scientific quality and prioritization of the experimental proposals presented in Calls for Access to the VEGA laser system published by the CLPU.
- 3.2 **Access Policy:** Guidelines governing the actions of the CLPU when allowing access to its facilities, systems and equipment. It is devised by the Direction of the CLPU and approved by the Executive Commission.
- 3.3 **Call for proposals:** Public offer for the use of the VEGA laser system, including preparation and experimentation.
- 3.4 **Cycle of Access:** Period of access included in each call.
- 3.5 **Experimental session:** 8-hour shift. Each call will offer a set of sessions to be allocated to approved proposals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolución de 30 de septiembre de 2008, de la Secretaría General de Política Científica y Tecnológica, por la que se publica el Convenio específico de colaboración, entre el Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, la Comunidad de Castilla y León y la Universidad de Salamanca, para la creación del consorcio para la construcción, equipamiento y explotación del Centro de Láseres Pulsados Ultracortos Ultraintensos

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 4 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

## 4 DESCRIPTION

### 4.1 Selection of members

The Director of the CLPU will invite internationally renowned members of the scientific and technological community to join the Access Committee, taking into account their experience and thematic or interdisciplinary specialization.

The number of members will be determined by the number of received proposals, or their degree of complexity. Both time and dedication availability of the evaluators will be taken into account in order not to block or stall the system.

### 4.2 Appointments and renewals

The Executive Commission of the CLPU, upon request of the Director, will approve the list of members of the Access Committee, in renewable periods of four years. If possible, the renewals of the members of the Access Committee will take place gradually. If any previously appointed member has to be replaced before the expiration of the term, a new member will be appointed for the remaining time until the completion of the four-year term upon appointment of the substituted member, without prejudice to the possibility of renewal.

This list will be formed by a minimum of 5 experts, of which one at least will belong to the CLPU and the rest will belong to external national or foreign institutions that are not a part of the Consortium.


The Director of the CLPU will select the Chairman of the Committee from this list, who will be appointed for four years, with the possibility of renewal for four additional years.

### 4.3 Composition of the Committee in each call

The composition of the Access Committee that will participate in each call is:

- **Chairman**
- **Secretary:** Member of the CLPU, with the right to speak but not to vote.
- **Evaluators:** Variable number (minimum of 3) depending on the volume or content of the received proposals.

It will be possible to add to the Committee, as an **external adviser** (with the right to speak but not to vote), one or more experts in some field or subject if necessary for the appropriate analysis of some of the received proposals.

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 5 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0


#### 4.4 Functions

- **Chairman of the Access Committee**
  - Promotes the smooth operation of the Access Committee, ensuring compliance with the regulations.
  - Distributes the proposals to the evaluators according to their experience.
  - Coordinates the work of the evaluators.
  - Calls and chairs the meetings of the evaluators.
  - Sets the agenda of items for discussion in each meeting.
  
- **Secretary**
  - Writes final reports for each presented proposal with the conclusions adopted in meetings.
  - Composes a prioritized list of proposals according to the decisions taken in the meeting.
  - Assists the Chairman in his/her duties and promotes the smooth operation of the Executive Commission, by assessing and giving the necessary information to the members of the Commission to meet the objectives of the call.
  
- **Evaluators**
  - Advise the Director of the CLPU
  - Study, evaluate and inform about the access requests to the CLPU by researchers and research groups that apply to use the petawatt laser system in each call, according to the general evaluation criteria and those specified in the call.
  - Propose a reasoned and prioritized list of applications.

#### 4.5 Basic principles of action

As a general rule, the action of the members of the Committee appointed for the evaluation of the submitted proposals will be based in the following basic principles:

- **Evaluation by experts:** The evaluators will be experts with appropriate knowledge and experience.
- **Prioritization of proposals applying the criteria** of evaluation established in the call for access and following the Access Policy.
- **Ethical standards:** The evaluators will evaluate the proposals in accordance to the fundamental ethical principles, such as integrity and honesty, delight in cognition, responsibility, sense of duty, social commitment, ...
- **Transparency:** The evaluation process will be transparent to all the participants, and based in clear rules and procedures.
- **Impartiality:** Every proposal submitted to the call will receive the same treatment, evaluating the merits and regardless of the origin or identity of the applicants.
- **Confidentiality:** The evaluators will treat every proposal confidentially, as well as any related information or documentation.

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 6 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

- **Avoidance of favoritisms** towards specific scientific disciplines, regions, countries or institutions, not foreseen in the criteria of the call for access.
- **Statement and resolution of conflicts of interest:** The evaluators will notify if they have any conflict of interest with the applicants for access. In this case, the evaluator will not participate in the evaluation or discussion of the proposals for that call.

The CLPU will consider as conflicts of interest, among others, the following:

- o The evaluator is applying for access in the call, or is participant in the preparation of a submitted application for access.
- o The evaluator would directly benefit from the approval of a specific proposal.
- o The evaluator is or has been a collaborator, member of the same research group, co-author, or assessor of an applicant.
- o The evaluator is a member of the same institution as one of the applicants.
- o The evaluator has a family relationship with one of the applicants.
- o The evaluator is in a situation that would hamper his/her ability to impartially evaluate a proposal.


However, if the small number of capable experts to evaluate the submitted proposals made it necessary, an evaluator from an applicant institution could join the Access Committee, as long as there are no other debarring circumstances. This expert would participate only in the evaluation and discussion of other proposals, not related to his/her institution.

#### 4.6 General Evaluation Criteria

##### A. General Evaluation Criteria

The general evaluation criteria that will generally apply to the evaluation of the access proposals submitted in each call will be:

- ✓ Quality or scientific excellence
  - Quality and originality of the project and research plan (methodology, objectives, rationale)
    - A. The scientific and technical relevance in relation with other submitted proposals.
    - B. Novelty and relevance of the objectives in relation with the current status of knowledge in the subject.
    - C. Suitability of the methodology, research design and work plan in relation with the objectives of the project.
  - Scientific or academic excellence of the researchers (Scientific background, publications, institution they belong to) and collaborators
    - A. Capability of the main researcher and of the rest of the team for the development of the programmed activities.
    - B. Previous obtained results and recent contributions of the research teams in the field related to the proposal.
    - C. Scientific and technical contributions that can be expected from the applicant team.
- ✓ Potential impact
  - Contribution to the scientific community and innovation and development potential for specific fields of science or technology.

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 7 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

- Social, economical and industrial relevance of the expected results.
  - Impact on the implied institutions (competitiveness, growth, employment).
  - Existence of an adequate and sufficient plan of diffusion and transference of the results of the project.
  - Possible exploitation of the results (intellectual property, patents).
- ✓ Promotion of talent and openness to new users
    - Complementarity of the participating research teams and benefits of the coordination.
    - Participation of young researchers.
    - Access for the first time of the researchers to the CLPU.
    - Participation of researchers from foreign institutions.

#### B. Particular Evaluation Criteria

They will be determined, if any, in each published call.

The evaluators will have to exclude any proposal which contravenes the fundamental ethical principles.

#### 4.7 Action procedure

##### ✓ Assignment of proposals to evaluators

When deciding the date for the opening of a new call and establishing the deadlines for the submission of applications, the CLPU will also set the deadlines for the assignment of proposals to the evaluators, the deadline for the delivery of the reports prepared by the evaluators and the dates of the evaluators meetings for the debate, selection and prioritization of the proposals.


The Chairman of the Access Committee will distribute the proposals sent by the Internal Committee to the evaluators depending on their area of expertise and performing a fair distribution of the workload. Each proposal will be reviewed by two evaluators at least, which will individually analyze it, applying the evaluation criteria established in the call.

##### ✓ Evaluation and rating of the proposals

Each evaluator will have to examine the proposals that have been assigned within the specified deadline, using the FARO<sup>2</sup> management tool for this.

If the evaluator notices that there is a situation of conflict of interests, he/she will inform the Chairman, who with the Director of the CLPU will designate a new evaluator to substitute the disqualified one, or if this is not possible, will decide to proceed with the evaluator as explained in section 4.5 "Basic principles of action".

<sup>2</sup> The use and functions by different user roles of the **FARO (Facilities Access Request Online)** web tool is explained in the "FARO application management software Manual - Competitive Access (Call for Proposals) for VEGA".

	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 8 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

If the evaluator deems the reception of additional information from the applicant necessary for the correct evaluation of a proposal, a making a direct enquiry will be possible through the FARO management application. Both the query as well as the answer provided by the applicant will be visible for all those with access permission to the application.

✓ **Preparation of brief reports and initial scoring of the proposals by the evaluators**

After the proposal is examined, the evaluator will complete an Individual Referee Report" (See Annex 5.1) that is available in the FARO management tool, and will be submitted within the deadline to the Chairman of the Committee.

✓ **Periodicity of the meetings**

The periodicity of the meetings will depend on the call. As a general rule, a meeting will be held, either in person or via videoconference.

If in addition to the final meeting, other contact between members of the Access Committee would be deemed as necessary, the use of new technologies will be fostered (videoconferences, information systems, forums...).

✓ **Holding meetings**

The Chairman of the Committee will hold the general evaluator meeting on the specified date.


Once the evaluators have met, the Chairman will direct the preliminary meeting to review the evaluation criteria and to establish the work plan.

The Access Committee will discuss the scientific quality and other applicable criteria, taking into account the report prepared by the Internal Committee of the CLPU in relation with viability, safety and radiological associated aspects as well as the resources that will foreseeably be necessary for the execution of the proposal under evaluation.

The Access Committee will have to reach a consensual conclusion about the final score, that will be one of the following:

- A Approved proposals, with an assignation of experimental sessions.
- B Approved proposals that have no experimental sessions assigned. They may be granted access in case of renounce by any of the applicants from the A group, if any slot is made available.
- C Proposals that have not successfully passed the evaluation, because of their lack of interest from a scientific point of view, even if they are viable.
- D Proposals that have not successfully passed the evaluation, because of not being viable, even if they may be of scientific interest.



	Access Committee Guidelines and Rules	Pág. 9 de 11
	Management Division	Mar 2017
		Ed. 1 Rev. 0

✓ **Preparation of reports and prioritized lists by the Access Committee**

The Access Committee will leave written record of the final report of each proposal. The Secretary will prepare these reports, completing the "Access Committee Report" (See Annex 5.2) available in the FARO management tool. A copy will be printed, signed by the Chairman, filed and stored for a minimum period of 5 years.

The report will contain the final conclusion about its approval or refusal. In the case of refusal, if the defects are rectifiable, recommendations about the modification of the proposal could be included.

A prioritized list of proposals from groups A and B will be prepared and justified, grouping proposals according to the system and phase that they are granted access to and according to rating. Also, a decision about the number of granted sessions and order in each group will be taken. The Secretary will be in charge of the development of the preparation of the list according to the agreements reached in the meeting.

✓ **Access authorization**

The Secretary of the Committee will send a copy of the final reports (through the FARO management tool) and of the list to the Director of the CLPU, who will take the final decision about the authorized accesses, seeking an optimal use of the resources of the Center to maximize its performance.

The final decision about access, as well as the conclusions and, if applicable, recommendations, of the evaluation will be automatically sent by the FARO management tool to the applicants.

**4.8 Funding of the Access Committee: Fees and Expenses**

When possible, the relations with other centers and sectors will be fostered, favoring the exchange of evaluators in the committees of other ICTS (Unique Scientific and Technical Infrastructures).

The members of the Access Committee will not receive any compensation for their services, however, they will be reimbursed for travel, board and lodging expenses generated by their attendance to the in-person meetings that are hold.

## 5 ANNEXES

### 5.1 Individual Referee Report

You may find this form in digital format in the FARO management tool, accessible through the website of the CLPU.

**Individual Referee Report**

\* Date of evaluation

*GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA*

**Scientific Quality (Max. 50%)**

Quality & originality of the project & research plan (Max. 25%)

Scientific-technical relevance in comparison to other applications received (%)

Innovative & relevant objectives in comparison to the state-of-the-art knowledge (%)

Planning, experimental arrangements & working plan adequate to the project objectives (%)

Total:

Researchers & collaborators scientific or academic excellence (Max. 25%)

IP & research team capacity to carry out the programmed activities (%)

Previous results & recent contributions to the research team on the project field (%)

Expected scientific-technical contributions of the research team to the project (%)

Total:

**Potential Impact (Max. 25%)**

Contribution to the scientific community (%)

Social, economic or industrial importance of expected results (%)

Impact to the participants (competitiveness, growth, employment) (%)

Existence of an adequate & sufficient plan for dissemination and transfer of results (%)

Chances of exploitation of results (intellectual property, patents) (%)

Total:

**Talent Promotion (Max. 10%)**

Complementary research team & coordination benefits (%)

New researchers involvement (%)

First access to CLPU of researchers (%)

Participation of international researchers (%)

Total:

*PARTICULAR EVALUATION CRITERIA*

H2020 (Max. 15%)

Total:

**TOTAL SCORE (%) (General & Particular criteria)**

\*Final conclusion

Recommendations (if any)

## 5.2 Access Committee Report

You may find this form in digital format in the FARO management tool, accessible through the website of the CLPU.

Access Committee Report

\* Date of evaluation

*GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA*

**Scientific Quality (Max. 50%)**

Quality & originality of the project & research plan (Max. 25%)	Average
Scientific-technical relevance in comparison to other applications received (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Innovative & relevant objectives in comparison to the state-of-the-art knowledge (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Planning, experimental arrangements & working plan adequate to the project objectives (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
<b>Total:</b>	<input type="text" value="NaN"/>

**Researchers & collaborators scientific or academic excellence (Max. 25%)**

IP & research team capacity to carry out the programmed activities (%)	0±0
Previous results & recent contributions to the research team on the project field (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Expected scientific-technical contributions of the research team to the project (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
<b>Total:</b>	<input type="text" value="NaN"/>

**Potential Impact (Max. 25%)**

Contribution to the scientific community (%)	0±0
Social, economic or industrial importance of expected results (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Impact to the participants (competitiveness, growth, employment) (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Existence of an adequate & sufficient plan for dissemination and transfer of results (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Chances of exploitation of results (intellectual property, patents) (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
<b>Total:</b>	<input type="text" value="NaN"/>

**Talent Promotion (Max. 10%)**

Complementary research team & coordination benefits (%)	0±0
New researchers involvement (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
First access to CLPU of researchers (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
Participation of international researchers (%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
<b>Total:</b>	<input type="text" value="NaN"/>

*PARTICULAR EVALUATION CRITERIA*

H2020 (Max. 15%)	<input type="text"/> 0±0
<b>Total:</b>	<input type="text" value="0"/>

**TOTAL SCORE (%) (General & Particular criteria)**

\*Final conclusion

\*Evaluation

**A (Approved)**     
  **B (Waiting list)**  
 **C (Not Approved - Minor scientific interest)**     
  **D (Not Approved - Not feasible)**

Sessions awarded  Ej: 4.5

Recommendations (if any)