

Minutes NMI3-II WP5 „Integrated User Access“ Meeting

Dec. 4, 2012, FRM II, Garching, Germany

Participants: Björn Abt (PSI), Rozsa Baranyai (BNC), Flavio Carsughi (JCNS), Mirjam van Daalen (PSI), Emmanuel Farhi (ILL), Thomas Gutberlet (HZB), Stefan Janssen (PSI), Recardo Leal (ILL), Alain Menelle (LLB), Pavel Mikula (NPI), Jean-Francois Moulin (HZG), Jürgen Neuhaus (FRM II)

The meeting was opened by Thomas Gutberlet, who gave a short update of the status of the activities of the work package.

Due to management issues at partner TUM the partner representatives in WP5 agreed to relocate the staff costs in the project budget from partner TUM to partner HZB. HZB will hire a software engineer for software prototype development at HZB within the next 3 months.

Main activities within the last nine months were on Task 5.2 ‘Development of a generalized integrated user registration’, Task 5.3 ‘Harmonized proposal forms and templates’ and Task 5.4 ‘Web based proposal peer review process’. As agreed in the Kick-off meeting of the WP during the NMI3-II Kick-off meeting in Grenoble on March 13, 2012 information on current proposal forms were collected and the general structure on surveys on proposal procedures by users and reviewer process by reviewers has been developed. The results on these actions were presented and discussed.

- The user survey ‘Proposal Procedures’ was presented and discussed. The survey is technically settled at HZB and it was agreed to contact all active users of the individual facilities via e-mail to participate in this survey in January 2013 by the local user offices.
The aim of this survey is a feedback by users on their view on current proposal submission and review processes and the option for harmonized procedures and single entry point. The survey can be found in the Annex to these minutes.
- The ‘reviewer survey’ was presented and discussed. The survey is also technically settled at HZB and it was agreed to contact all reviewers active during the last five years at the individual facilities via e-mail to participate in this survey in January 2013 by the local user offices.
The aim of that survey is a feedback by reviewers about their view on current proposal review processes and the option for harmonized procedures and single entry point. The survey can also be found in the Annex to these minutes.
- The result of an evaluation of current used proposal forms was presented and discussed. The evaluation included proposals of HZB, SINQ, LLB, ISIS, ILL, FRM II, BNC, TUD, NPI and HZG. Based on the evaluation made a generalized structure and content including harmonized requests to the proposers will be developed and presented as web template for the next meeting (D5.4), see Annex to these minutes.

Mirjam van Daalen (PSI) and Björn Abt (PSI) presented an overview of the Umbrella concept for single entry point management and general user authentication to user office systems. The concept could offer a basic platform for single entry point management, handling of user authentication between facilities and possible transfer of information as proposals between facilities. The usage of this concept will be further discussed within the WP in the course of ongoing activities.

The meeting was closed with the option for a next meeting in summer 2013 to discuss results of the by then launched surveys and possible presentation of harmonized proposal form templates. Place and date are to be decided.

Annex:

User survey

Reviewer survey

Harmonized proposal form

WP5 Integrated User Access

Report on requirements: Survey on existing comparable systems and report on requirements and framework for common data exchange (to be delivered: month 12)

User Survey Proposal Procedures

It is common practice for scientists to apply for beamtime at neutron and muon sources by facility based proposal procedures. These procedures have been developed within the last decades. Internet based procedures are common today which may offer new options to improve this service and to make it more attractive and efficient for the scientific community.

In order to determine current usage of digital processed proposal systems and to identify possible improvements and requirements we kindly ask the users of the European neutron and muon facilities to participate in the present survey. The survey is part of the NMI3-II work package on Integrated User Access.

How many proposals did you submit within the past 5 years (including proposals as co-proposer)?

Of how many of these were you the main proposer?

How many facilities did you use within this period?

How many experimental visits to neutron or muon facilities did you have within this period?

Main methods used (tick up to 3 with "strg"):

- Powder diffraction
- Single crystal diffraction
- Stress/strain measurements
- 3-axis and tof spectroscopy
- Spin-echo spectroscopy
- SANS
- Reflectometry
- Radiography/Tomography
- MuSR
- Other

If other method which: ...

What sources of financial support did you use (tick several if applicable)?

- EU support
- Internal resources
- Support by the facility you used
- Other

If other which: ...

How did you submit your proposals to the facilities (tick several if applicable)?

- Web based user portal
- E-mail submission
- Other

If other which: ...

If you used a web based user portal, how did you like them (give grades for 0 (very bad) to 10 (very good))?

Helpful platforms (1-10)
Difficult to use (yes) (no) (maybe)
Easy access/log in (yes) (no) (maybe)

Assuming that each facility operates its own web based user platform, would you
like harmonized forms and procedures across existing platforms? (yes) (no) (maybe)
like harmonized deadlines across existing facilities? (yes) (no) (maybe)
like a unified entry point to existing platforms? (yes) (no) (maybe)

If yes would you
like to share submitted proposals to several facilities for review? (yes) (no) (maybe)
like to move rejected proposals at one facility for review to another facility?
(yes) (no) (maybe)
like to have your proposal reviewed by a joined facility review committee?
(yes) (no) (maybe)
like to have proposals not accepted due to overload at one facility automatically moved to
review to another facility? (yes) (no) (maybe)

General comments:

Subject: NMI3 User Survey on Proposal Procedures
From: Thomas Gutberlet <thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 12:38:51 +0100
To: Thomas Gutberlet <thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de>

Dear colleagues,

It is common practice for scientists to apply for beamtime at neutron and muon sources by facility based proposal procedures. These procedures have been developed within the last decades. Internet based procedures are common today which may offer new options to improve this service and to make it more attractive and efficient for the scientific community.

Within the current NMI3-II Access Program an action has been launched on "Integrated User Access" to investigate current and improve possible future proposal procedures at the European neutron and muon user facilities.

For this purpose we kindly ask the users of the European neutron and muon facilities to participate in the present survey. The survey is part of the NMI3-II work package on Integrated User Access. It is hosted by the Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin and strictly anonymous.

Please use the link below to use the survey and spend a few minutes to help us.

http://www.helmholtz-berlin.de/user/user-info/eu-access/eu-access-nmi3/proposal-procedures/index_en.html

Thank you for your kind help. Sincerely
Thomas Gutberlet
(NMI3-II WP5 work package leader)

--

Dr. Thomas Gutberlet
Head of User Coordination (NP-A1)

phone +49 30 8062 42778, 12904
fax +49 30 8062 42523
mobil +49 172 3949605
thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de

WP5 Integrated User Access

Requirements for web based review process: Report on requirements for web based review process (to be delivered: month 12)

Reviewer Survey

It is common practice for scientists to apply for beamtime at neutron and muon sources by facility based proposal procedures. The submitted proposals are usually reviewed by international experts and beam time is granted based on the scientific merit of the proposed project. These procedures have been developed within the last decades.

In order to determine current usage of the review based proposal system and to identify possible improvements and requirements we kindly ask the reviewers of the European neutron and muon facilities to participate in the present survey. The survey is part of the NMI3-II work package on Integrated User Access.

In how many proposal review committees have you been a member of in the past 5 years?

To how many years did your memberships add up to (possibly >>10)?

How many proposals did you review per year, on average?

How much time does it take you to review a proposal, on average (Please estimate in hours)?

In what ways did you receive proposals to review?

- in print by mail
- as pdf files via e-mail
- web based via facility User Office platform
- in print by mail with the possibility of access them also on the web

Which one of these ways do you prefer?

In what way have you submitted your reviews?

- in print by mail
- as pdf files via e-mail
- web based via facility User Office platform
- both via web based facility (prior the panel meeting) and during the meeting itself
- face-to-face discussion with other reviewers at a review panel meeting

Which one of these ways do you prefer?

How important do you consider face-to-face review panel meetings?

(give grades for 0 (unimportant) to 10 (very important))

Are skype or video conferences useful alternatives for face-to-face reviewer meetings?

(yes) (no) (maybe)

If you have worked with a web based User Office system, what did you think of its web-based procedures?

- helpful
- easy to use

too complicated
do not work off-line
other remarks:

If other remarks, which: ...

Would you consider it as helpful if a harmonized form/procedure for proposal submission across individual facilities would exist?

(yes) (no) (maybe)

Would you consider it as helpful if a centralized review process/panel across individual facilities would exist?

(yes) (no) (maybe)

Subject: NMI3 User Survey on Reviewing Procedures
From: Thomas Gutberlet <thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2012 12:38:49 +0100
To: Thomas Gutberlet <thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de>

Dear colleagues,

It is common practice for scientists to apply for beamtime at neutron and muon sources by facility based proposal procedures. The submitted proposals are usually reviewed by international experts and beam time is granted based on the scientific merit of the proposed project. These procedures have been developed within the last decades. Often internet based procedures are common today which may offer new options to improve this service and to make it more attractive and efficient for the scientific community.

Within the current NMI3-II Access Program an action has been launched on "Integrated User Access" to investigate current and improve possible future proposal and proposal review procedures at the European neutron and muon user facilities.

For this purpose we kindly ask you as active referee at a European neutron and muon facility to participate in the present survey. The aim of the survey is to identify your opinion about current operated reviewing procedures and possible options for future developments and improvements. The survey is part of the NMI3-II work package on Integrated User Access. It is hosted by the Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin and strictly anonymous.

Please use the link below to use the survey and spend a few minutes to help us.

http://www.helmholtz-berlin.de/user/user-info/eu-access/eu-access-nmi3/reviewer-survey/index_en.html

Thank you for your kind help. Sincerely
Thomas Gutberlet
(NMI3-II WP5 work package leader)

--

Dr. Thomas Gutberlet
Head of User Coordination (NP-A1)

phone +49 30 8062 42778, 12904
fax +49 30 8062 42523
mobil +49 172 3949605
thomas.gutberlet@helmholtz-berlin.de

WP5 Integrated User Access

Harmonized proposal forms: **Report** on suggestion on harmonized proposal forms and appropriate templates (to be delivered: month 36)

Harmonized Proposal Forms

For application of beamtime users are requested to submit a facility specific proposal to the facility. These forms usually have various items in common, but also facility dependent requirements, proposers have to fill in or answer.

In order to simplify and streamline current proposal forms for the users, a harmonized proposal form is suggested based on current existing forms at the participating facilities. The suggested harmonized proposal form could be a general accepted template with possible extensions for facility specific questions within the proposal requested.

The suggested harmonized proposal form is part of the NMI3-II work package on Integrated User Access.

The harmonized proposal form consists of three main parts:

- General part
- Technical part
- Scientific part

Within these parts the following information has to be given:

Harmonized proposal form: General Part

Proposer	Co-proposer	Experiment
Prenome	surname	Experiment title
Surname	prename	instrument
Nationality	nationality	days requested
Gender	e-mail	preferred days
Institution	phone	unacceptable dates
Department	fax	local contact
Street	institution	main reserach area
ZIP	department	proposal type
Town	adress	submitted to other facility
Phone	country	eligible EU funding
Fax	status	
e-mail		
Organisation		
Status		

Technical Part

Instrument	Sample	Safety
Wavelength	chemical formula	storage requirements
Polarization	volume	sample can/mounting device
excitation energy	weight	is sample
energy resolution	surface area	danger associated
momentum transfer range	space group	risks
momentum transfer resolution	lattice parameters	sample after experiment
temperature range	number of samples	
temperature stability	date of availability	
pressure range		
field range		
field homogeneity		
sample environment		
on-site lab use		

Scientific Part

Scientific description
abstract/summary
scientific context/background
necessity of neutron use
choice of instrument
preliminary work
detailed experimental plan
publication record

If agreed on the above structure a webform will be programmed to demonstrate the functionality of the harmonized proposal form.

days requested		x	x											
main reserach area	Cultural Heritage, Biology/M	x	Strongly co		x	x	x			x	x			x
scientific college	Soft Condensed Matter, Biolo	x				x								
complementary use of BER II/BESSY II		x												
BESSY II proposal number		x												
proposal part of	PhD, diploma, maters, bachel	x												
team experinece	new to this field, experienced	x												
proposal type	new proposal, continuation, i	x	relate prev		relate prev	x	x	x			x			x
longterm proposal							x							
submitted to other facility			x		x		x							x
industry						x								
eligible EU funding			x (given by		x		x	x		x	x			x
research funded by			x		x									
Instrument		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x
wavelength		x	x				x				x			x
polarization			x								x			x
excitation energy		x	x				x							x
energy resolution		x	x				x							x
momentum transfer range		x	x				x				x			x
momentum transfer resolution		x	x				x							x
special options		x	x		x									
temperature range		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x
temperature stability		x	x				x	x						x
pressure range			x	x	x	x	x							x
field range		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x
field homogeneity		x					x							x
sample environment	orange cryostat, CCR, furnace	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x
on-site lab use			x		x			x						x
simulation support							x							
Sample		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x
chemical formula	powder, liquid, singel crystal,	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x
volume		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x
weight		x	x		x	x	x				x			x
surface area		x					x							x
space group		x	x	x			x	x						x
lattice parameters	a, b, c, alpha, beta, gamma, t	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						x
number of samples				x				x	x	x				x
date of availability			x	x			x	x						x

Safety		x	x	x	x	x	x				x			x
storage requirements	kept col, under pressure, oth	x	x		x									x
sample can/mounting device	sealed container, glued to ba	x			x	x					x			x
is sample	radioactive, contaminant, tox	x	x	x	x	x	x				x			x
danger associated	yes, uncertain, no	x	x		x (hazard d	x					x			x
risks		x	x			x			x		x			x
sample after experiment	removed by user, stored at fa	x	x		x						x			x
sample activation							x				x			
allowance to handel radioact			x								x			
safety instruction agreement			x											
Scientific description		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x
abstract/summary		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x				x
scientific context/background		x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x			x
necessity of neutron use		x												
choice of instrument		x				x								
preliminary work		x									x			x
detailed experimental plan		x	x		x	x	x			x	x			x
publication record		x	x	x	x		x			x	x			x