

2013-2016 CFHT Large Programs

Implementation procedures

- 1) **Large Program Agency (LPA):** Large Programs (LP's) will be considered as a single QSO-Agency with time allocated independently by Canada, France, Hawaii and/or possibly Taiwan, Brazil, and China, as specified in item 2 below.
 - a) The treatment as a separate QSO-Agency is intended to ensure that Large Programs are allocated time on the same basis as PI programs. The national TACs will be given the right (see section 9 below) to, in rare circumstances, adjust a future PI proposal priority relative to a specific pre-existing competing large program.
 - b) The LPA is required to have the same proportion of priority-A and priority-B time as other QSO-Agencies (see Section 5 below).
 - c) A single Large Program may have all or part of its time assigned to priority-A and/or all or part to priority-B provided it remains within the total A or B time assigned to the LPA allocation (see 9c below). (In the first LP round all LPs had the same A/B mix as each other and as the other QSO agencies.)

- 2) **Allocation of time to the LPA:**
 - a) Canada and France will allocate up to 40% of their respective total Agency time allocation in each semester to the LPA for 2013A-2016B (inclusive), to be awarded in a competition with proposal due date of 28 February 2012 and formal SAC approval in May 2012. A second call may be issued for LPs to run 2015A-2016B, with proposals due early 2014 for approval May 2014, which will be allowed to allocate up to 10% of the respective Agency totals for these newer proposals.
 - b) Time awarded by the UH, Taiwanese, Brazilian, or Chinese TAC to their community participants in large programs will be in addition to the Canadian and French time.
 - c) It is understood that initial time commitments once awarded to a LP may only be reconsidered at the proposed mid-program review (item 7 below).
 - d) The LPA will have filled its quota when either Canada or France reach the 40% limit noted in (a) above.
 - e) An excess of allocation of up to +5% will be added to either the Canadian or French LPA allocation if it would help include a highly ranked proposal to fit within the LPA allocation. (e.g., consider a point in the allocation process when the LP allocations are at the 35% and 20% level for Canada and France respectively. The next ranked LP requires an additional 10% from France and 10% from Canada, bringing the totals to 30% for France and 45% for Canada. Such a proposal would be acceptable under this rule.)
 - f) It is not necessary to fill the entire 40% time allocation for the LPA with proposals from the initial call.
 - g) The partner Agencies will support Large Programs for a period of up to 4 years. It is explicit policy that no 'extensions' will be given to LPs beyond 2016B; a new application for a new PI or large program is required.

- 3) **Large Program Agency Review Committee (LPARC):**
 - a) The 2013 LPARC will be constituted as a unique panel, to review, rank and recommend the total allocation of time in hours to a large program including, when necessary or advisable, a split of a program into priority A and priority B parts. The LPARC+SAC may recommend that no time be awarded for a given proposal.
 - b) Given the expected number of LP's, a panel of 6 to 8 voting members from agencies which have committed by December 31/2011 is appropriate. It is expected that most of the LPARC members will be drawn from scientists who have recently retired from the national TACs. If a submitted

- proposal includes a proposed allocation from UH, Taiwan, Brazil, or China then these bodies can contribute a non-voting member to the LPARC.
- c) The Board will ask the CFHT ED to invite nominees recommended by SAC in early March 2012 to serve on the LPARC on behalf of the Partner Agencies.
 - d) LPARC Chair: The ED, in consultation with the SAC Chair and Vice-Chair, will designate a Chair for the LPARC from among the LPARC members.
 - e) Non-voting SAC members may participate in the LPARC meeting, to provide comments and context as needed to assist the work of the LPARC. One representative from each partner agency, preferably members of the CFHT TAC, will be appropriate.
 - f) The CFHT will also have a non-voting member present to provide technical advice as needed; if possible, this will be the Director of Science Operations or someone thoroughly familiar with QSO. (It should not be the ED, who is ultimately responsible for the allocation of time to *all* programs.)
 - g) Both voting and non-voting representatives will recuse themselves from discussion of proposals in which they are involved, should that situation arise.
- 4) **Charge of LPA time to the participating Agencies:**
- a) The LP proposals must specify the allocation of time among the participating CFHT partners (CFH) and any associate agencies that are involved (Taiwan, Brazil, China).
 - b) The community TACs will be invited to comment on the appropriateness of the proposal's recommending assignment of hours to that community. For communities which have not agreed in advance to allocate time to the LPA (UH, Taiwan, Brazil, China), the national TAC of those agencies which are named in any proposal will comment on the scientific value of said proposal(s) and specify what (if any) time allocation that community is willing to add to the LPA. (Note: under 3b above, the contributing community may participate in a non-voting capacity in the LPARC.)
 - c) Minor disagreements on time assignment will be referred to the CFHT TAC, with a recommendation, for a final decision.
 - d) Significant disagreements on time assignment should be referred immediately to the designated Agency members for further action.
 - e) The designation of minor and significant above is a matter of judgement within the TACs (i.e., Is it likely that the CFHT TAC can reach an equitable compromise?). A suggested guideline is that a significant difference of opinion arises if the difference between the PI and TAC assigned Agency shares could affect 10% or more of the total partner Agency allocation to the LPA.
- 5) **Proposal Process:** The LP proposals will be handled as follows:
- a) The LP proposals are in response to a specific call issued by the CFHT. No letter of intent stage will occur for the call for LPs to begin in 2013A.
 - i) As noted above in 4a, the proposal should specify the time to be allocated from each participating partner.
 - ii) In addition, the proposal may include a recommendation for a community and world proprietary time (see Item 6 below).
 - iii) The CFHT will provide the usual technical evaluation to be made available to the LPARC.
 - b) LP proposals are sent to the partner TAC's involved in the Proposal.
 - i) The partner TAC's will provide written comments on the proposals, including specifically the comments requested under point 4b above, to LPARC through their respective CFHT TAC members, in sufficient time that the LPARC members have the TAC comments available before making their ranking. SAC will receive a copy of these comments.
 - ii) The partner TAC's will not rank the proposals.
 - c) The LP proposals are distributed to the LPARC in a timely manner.

- i) The LPARC will evaluate the proposals on the basis of scientific merit and may include considerations of legacy value, proprietary period, risk factors (and consequences for incomplete data collection), and the track record of the team members in successfully pursuing large programs.
 - ii) The LPARC will convene as a panel just prior to the scheduled SAC meeting.
 - iii) The recommendations of the LPARC (as a ranking) will be provided to the CFHT SAC.
 - d) The CFHT SAC will consider the LPARC recommendations and advise the CFHT TAC (a subset of SAC) on scheduling the ranked LP's. The SAC may, for example, alter the ranking provided by the LPARC Chair or the priority assignment (A, B) of time, although modification of the LPARC ranking should occur only in exceptional circumstances.
 - i) Comments from the LPARC and SAC will be provided to the Proposal PI's.
 - e) The CFHT TAC resolves any remaining scheduling, priority or agency time charge issues in consultation with the Observatory.
- 6) **Proprietary Period:** There are at least two aspects to the matter of proprietary periods for data access, both of which may be addressed in the LP proposal:
- a) Participating community access:
 - i) The *default* is that all members of a participating community to a LP (i.e. allocating observing time to the LP) will have immediate access to the data through the CADDC.
 - ii) The PI may propose to retain the usual one year proprietary period for participating community access (or any other period not to exceed one year from the time the last data is acquired, as is the case for any PI program).
 - b) World Access:
 - i) The *default* is the standard one year proprietary period after the end of each semester for the duration of the LP.
 - ii) The PI may request, with justification, that world-access be denied for an extended period not to exceed one year after the **last** data in the LP is acquired.
- 7) **Mid-Program Review:** Each Large Programs shall be reviewed by SAC at the first possible SAC meeting immediately following the month marking half of the given LP's approved duration.
- a) These reviews will include:
 - i) a progress report (data acquired, publications, etc),
 - ii) an update on the observing plan for the remainder of the LP,
 - iii) any significant change in status among the Co-I's and other participants in the LP that could alter the balance of Agency time allocation within the LPA.
 - b) These reports will be made available to the participating agencies' TAC's, who may also wish to comment directly to their respective Agencies and SAC.
 - c) In case of unsatisfactory review, the observing time originally allocated to the LP may be modified, or the LP terminated.
- 8) **Subsequent Calls for LP's:**
- a) Subsequent calls for LP's would normally be *considered* every two years (roughly in phase with the SAC reviews of on-going programs).
 - b) The normal basis for issuing subsequent calls is notice from SAC of significant room within the available LPA envelope arising from:
 - i) the planned 10% expansion for programs beginning 2015A. Note that this is 10% of the currently-available contributing-agency time during the 2015-2016 period, and is not intended to be a goal of 50% total by that point, excepting case (ii) immediately below.
 - ii) If there has been the completion by 2015 of an LP, or a cessation of a currently-running LP during the midterm review of 2015, then the available time can be added to the 10%..

- c) Similarly a new call may be issued if either of the principal partners increases its cap on the fraction of Agency time made available to the LPA. Normally, a request for increasing the Agency caps would come through a recommendation from SAC in response to community scientific pressure.

9) **Other Considerations for LP's:**

- a) The LP and PI agencies equally share all risk factors, with weather being the primary example. When weather loss occurs, CFHT should attempt to balance the LPA and PI agencies as equally as possible; obviously a single RA program is much more fragile, and this may not be possible.
- b) CFHT balances the LPA as a single Agency against the other agencies. Because of this, the LPA needs to contain the same 40%/60% A/B class queue OBs as other Agencies. Normally each awarded LP would have this same 40/60% split to balance different LPs against each other; however, LPARC may recommend that a highly-meritorious LP receive higher fraction of the A-class time (as long as the LP Agency total remains 40/60).
- c) **Risk:** An LP which requests more than 2/3 of any `resource' (such as: instrument, dark time, RA range, seeing bracket) shall be flagged by the CFHT technical review as `risky' and LPARC shall consider this a negative in the ranking process. There can be no hard formula offered as to how much penalty should be applied, but awarding large amounts of CFHT time to a program whose science will be seriously impacted by the high probability of an incompletely-acquired data set is not considered desirable.

10) **Interaction between PI and LP programs.**

- a) On Feb. 1 and August 1 of each year, every active LP must supply CFHT with the RA distribution (at 1-hour RA resolution and hour of integration time requested, specifying requested conditions) for the coming semester. CFHT will post this as part of the call for proposals.
- b) All active LPs must submit (to CFHT) a progress report by May 1 and November 1 which CFHT is responsible for forwarding to SAC and to the chair of any national TAC which has contributed time to the given active LP.
- c) Submitted PI proposals will be reviewed by CFHT technical staff, who will provide the national TACs with comments on potential conflicts with any active LPs which that TAC also has contributed time to. Note that a proposal requesting similar RAs but different observing conditions is not in fact conflicting. CFHT must thus provide the TAC with the this technical review along with the original LP proposal and its current progress report, promptly after proposal submission.
- d) For any such flagged proposal to which the TAC awards time, the Agency's national TAC must provide CFHT instruction on how to deal with potential conflict with that Agency's portion of the LP award. This requires that all TAC members be familiar with both the original proposal and the progress reports of The TAC may:
 - i) Maintain the default (this is expected to be choice in the vast majority of cases). In this scenario CFHT will use Agency balancing to decide how to choose which programs to execute.
 - ii) The TAC may declare that PI proposal's time may be downgraded in priority. This will usually result in that proposal get no data until all of that Agency's time in the conflicting LP has been acquired.
 - iii) The TAC may declare that the PI proposal is extremely urgent and raise its priority, providing CFHT with instruction. Again, this only affects the relative priority between the Agency's award to that PI proposal and *that* Agency's portion of the award to the LP.