



October 2016

## Submission of Long-Term Proposals at the ILL

### Introduction

The ILL allows users from its member countries to apply for long-term beamtime, by submitting a Long Term Proposal (LTP). Both ILL Scientific Council and the ILL management believe that LTPs could be beneficial to the ILL community as a whole. The LTP scheme was introduced for the first time at the autumn proposal deadline in 2008.

LTPs are granted to ILL users for projects that extend over several cycles if it can be demonstrated that they bring extra resources or capabilities that are of benefit to users in general. About 10% of the total available beamtime is allocated to LTPs.

### 1. Principles

Users may request a long-term commitment from the ILL to provide beamtime during up to six successive scheduling periods (three years) without re-submission of new proposals.

Scientific excellence is the primary criterion for the acceptance of such a Long-Term Proposal (LTP). Further criteria are:

- a commitment from the proposing User group concerning the contribution of financial, technical and/or human resources during the implementation of the LTP;
- an identifiable benefit to the ILL User community (such as a new technique, a new instrument or new possibilities for the instrument) expected to result from the successful accomplishment of the goals for the LTP;
- clearly identified deliverables;
- full involvement of at least an ILL scientist.

### 2. Format of a LTP and schedule

Applications for beamtime should be submitted electronically via our Electronic Proposal Submission system (EPS), available on the [ILL Visitors Club website](#). The LTP text should contain sections detailed in the **Annexe A**.

LTPs can be submitted once a year with a fixed deadline, for decision on acceptance in the following subcommittee meetings. Beamtime for accepted LTPs becomes available during the following scheduling period.

The proposers may request a start delayed by one or two scheduling periods, if this is necessary to prepare properly the proposed experimental programme or secure complementary funding/support.

### **3. Spokesperson and participants**

Each LTP must be identified with a spokesperson. The spokesperson should be affiliated to a scientific institution of an ILL member country. Exceptions from this provision require prior agreement from the ILL Management. Co-proposers may come from different institutions, even outside the ILL member countries.

An ILL scientist cannot in principle act as the LTP spokesperson. However, the participation and full involvement of an ILL scientist – who will coordinate the internal LTP evaluation and then ensure the transfer of knowhow to other users – in the project is a necessary condition to LTP acceptance.

### **4. Evaluation procedure for a LTP**

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.

The routing of the proposal, the schedule and the comments required from the various persons involved and the option of including external referees are set out in **Appendix B** to this document.

### **5. LTP Reporting**

The implementation of a LTP requires yearly reports and a final report.

In case of failure to submit a yearly report, the ILL Management reserves the right to stop the allocation of beamtime to the User group operating the LTP.

Failure to submit a final report may affect the acceptance of future LTPs and beamtime proposals submitted by members of the User group concerned.

Scientific publications or technical developments and their impact, emerging from the LTP and included in the final report, will be considered a key item in the assessment. The input of instrument responsables and group leaders may also prove valuable, particularly where instrument or technique development is concerned.

The requirements on, and the routing and evaluation of, these reports are set out in **Annexe C** to this document.

### **6. Ownership of equipment and developments related to LTPs**

One of the outcomes of LTPs may be the development of new instrumentation or techniques at ILL, a new element of software or sample environment. It is expected that at the end of the project such improvements will become available to all ILL users through the normal process of application for beamtime. To ensure that this will be possible in practice, an ILL scientist should be included in the LTP team.

In some cases, such developments will involve equipment that has been brought to ILL by the external partners; ownership of such equipment after the LTP has ended should be agreed beforehand, and the expectation would generally be that such items passed to ILL ownership.

## Annexes to LTP procedure

### Annexe A

#### Structure of the proposal

- For the submission of a LTP the specific LTP application form must be used. It contains the following sections:
- Lists of names and affiliation of LTP spokesperson, collaborators and the name of the ILL scientist who is involved in the project (ILL correspondent)
- A short **abstract**, not exceeding 1200 characters (about 200 words), summarising the proposal;
- A presentation of the **scientific case** and the **development aspects** of the proposal, outlining in particular the reasons for filing a LTP, the results expected, and milestones, i.e. the scientific and/or technical goals for each year of the period covered by the LTP;
- A summary of the **competence** of the proposing scientists to carry out the proposal;
- **References** to publications relevant to the scientific or technical subject (in order to allow the Subcommittees to obtain detailed information in the field, if needed);
- **Beamtime(s)** and **instrument(s)** requested for each scheduling period within the total period covered by the LTP;
- A description of the proposed **technical implementation** of the LTP. Besides the standard information requested from all applications for beamtime (such as the instrument equipment and set-up, sample environment issues, safety issues, special support ...) it must specify:
  - o resources and services the Users assume to be available at the ILL,
  - o extra efforts expected from the ILL in terms of staff and instrumentation,
  - o contributions of the User group to the execution of the LTP, including human and financial resources for the construction, commissioning and operation of specific equipment brought by the User group.
- Information about how and when the proposing User group expects to obtain the **resources** (human and financial) needed for the implementation of the LTP, including whether or not the User group needs the prior acceptance of the LTP to secure the resources required;
- The **long-term benefits** to the ILL User community expected from the successful implementation of the LTP. This could consist, for example, in new instrumentation, a new technique, or a new community using the ILL;
- **A clear description of the LTP deliverables.**

## **Annexe B**

### **Evaluation of the proposal**

The LTP will undergo a internal and external evaluation procedures, the internal step being performed by ILL staff, and the external carried out by competent people in the concerned Subcommittee.

LTP proposals is sent for comments to the instrument(s) responsible(s), requested support service responsible(s), ILL safety officers and chairs of the concerned subcommittees. The latter will coordinate consultation (via email) with the other subcommittee members. The Subcommittee Chairman can ask the ILL via the User Office for external refereeing by a specified person.

The evaluation should address:

- safety and technical feasibility issues (safety officer, support service responsible(s), instrument responsible(s))
- the adequateness of the beamtime requested (instrument responsible(s)),
- the adequateness of the financial and human resources requested and offered (instrument responsible(s), support service responsible(s)),
- the impact on instrument operation and on normal proposals scheduled for the same instrument (instrument responsible(s)),
- the consistency of the LTP with ILL Medium-Term Scientific Plan (Head of science division).
- any identifiable benefit to the ILL User community - such as a new technique, a new instrument or new possibilities for the instrument (panel members)

Once this feedback is collected, an ILL evaluation panel will meet. It will include: The head of science division, college secretaries, head of the user office and head of the sample environment service. All ILL correspondants will be invited to the panel meeting to defend the project. The beamdays needed by the LTPs accepted by the ILL management will be taken out from the total available beamtime.

The ILL internal decision should be completed one month after the submission deadline and will be forwarded to the relevant subcommittee. The subcommittee will no longer need to discuss LTPs during the panel meeting.

The Subcommittee(s) will continue reviewing the yearly reports of active LTPs.

There may be cases where a conflict of interest arises, for example between work proposed through an LTP, and that proposed by the conventional route by another research group. Here ILL management may need to intervene, using the Subcommittee recommendations of the merits of each LTP and of individual, conventional proposals. ILL management may also need to monitor and perhaps limit the extent to which beamtime is given to LTPs to prevent it diminishing excessively the amount available for scheduling through the normal route.

Particular attention may need to be given to experiments that are naturally relatively long, and where just one approved programme has the potential to take a significant fraction of beamtime available on a particular instrument.

## **Annexe C Reporting**

### **1. General structure of the reports**

Both the Yearly Reports and the Final Report will consist of two parts: one submitted by the LTP spokesperson, and one submitted by the relevant instrument responsible(s) after validation by the Group Leader concerned.

### **2. The Yearly Report**

#### ***2.1. Contents***

The two parts of the Yearly Report should highlight the scientific results and the status of the project. They must make reference to the applicable milestones as indicated in the original LTP. Any failure, change in strategy, unexpected problems, etc. must be clearly indicated.

#### ***2.2. Routing, schedule and evaluation***

The Yearly Report from the LTP spokesperson is submitted to the User Office by 1 September of each year of activity of the proposal. The User Office sends the complete Yearly Report to the relevant Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee will comment on the Yearly Report at the autumn subcommittee meeting and will decide on further beamtime for the LTP, or change the allocation if appropriate. The Subcommittee will provide the LTP spokesperson with written feedback on the Yearly Report.

#### ***2.3. Use for re-submission***

The Yearly Reports may contain elements relevant to a possible renewal of the LTP. They can be used as supporting material for a re-submission, in order to avoid time gaps in beamtime allocation between the end of the LTP and its possible renewal.

### **3. The Final Report**

#### ***3.1. Contents***

The Final Report shall comment on the success of the LTP, report on the main scientific results and provide a list of the scientific publications that emerged from the LTP and a copy of the key publication. It shall set out the technical accomplishments and the benefits resulting from the LTP for both the LTP User group and the ILL User community.

#### ***3.2. Routing, schedule and evaluation***

The LTP spokesperson submits the Final Report to the User Office by 1 September of the year following the last allocation of beamtime. The further routing, schedule, evaluation and feedback is analogous to those of the Yearly Reports.