

# ALMA TAC

(impressions from a panel member)

# Panel Composition

- 18 panels (4,4,4,4,2 in category 1,2,3,4,5);  
8 members per panel  
144 members ARP  
*Not all members are ALMA or experts in interferometry / submm  
Science experts!*  
“Technical assessor” present in each panel
- 18 chairs + 1 chair of chairs  
19 members ARPC
- **80-100** proposals/panel
- barring conflicts **everyone should review the proposals**
- 1 primary reviewer/proposal  
**\*all\*** are secondary reviewers

# Panel duties (1)

- Two stages process (Stage 1 & Stage 2)

- **Stage 1 (at home; to be concluded by beginning of June):**

assessing possible conflicts (reduce the # of proposals per assessor);

check the correct category;

ranking of all proposals (range 1 to 10) **only** on the scientific merit;

mean of all “normalised” votes

**Triage** (most important output from Stage 1)

*Bottom ~25% proposals are **NOT** discussed in Stage 2*

*(apart few “resurrections”)*

**\*All\* assessors write a brief report / note for \*each\* proposal on a webtool**

**Primary reviewers should draft a first version of the consensus report**

(these reports are FINAL for triaged proposals)

# Panel duties (2)

- **Stage 2 (at the ARP meeting venue; 20-23 June):**

discussion of the **non-triaged** proposals and of **ALL** large programs;  
primary assessors present for each proposals strengths and weaknesses  
proposals of similar topics are discussed side by side

**The reports/notes by all assessors are very useful to shorten the discussion!**

new (secret) vote and new ranking;  
review of the proposals with large standard deviations;  
new (panel) ranking at the end of ARP

***Top proposals should end up in priority A***

*(but not so easy)*

*Everything is done to be normalised in the same way (and compared to other panels)*

**The primary assessor write the final “consensus report”**

(the notes/report by all assessors collected on the ARP review page, and the discussion, are **very very** useful for the final report!)

# Issues

- **Different “shares” determine different **final** rankings at ARPC**  
a “very good” European proposal can obtain a lower ranking than a “mean” Chilean proposal  
*A panel member **does not know** the final ranking! Only the chairs...*
- **Large programs had very **strict** conflict rules:**  
few assessors ... (at least last year) / large spreads in votes / less reliable ?

# Issues

- **Different “shares” determine different **final** rankings at ARPC**  
a “very good” European proposal can obtain a lower ranking than a “mean” Chilean proposal  
*A panel member **does not know** the final ranking! Only the chairs...*
- **Large programs had very **strict** conflict rules:**  
few assessors ... (at least last year) / large spreads in votes / less reliable ?
- **Very good / very bad proposals reach consensus already at Stage 1!**  
easy to recognise them
- **Main goal for YOU:** stay above the triage line!  
*category C scheduling can be “easy” at least for band 3 proposals (less strict conditions)*
  - **clear and simple text and self-contained**
  - **clear and readable figures**
  - **clear feasibility (you need to show that you know what to do with the data!)**
  - **not too specific on the details (panel members are NOT all expert in your field)**