TAC report
Subaru UM 2005

K. Ohta

（Kyoto)

2005.12.22

statistics
see poster!

Trends are

- Number of proposals tends to decrease
- Oversubscription 4-5
- Many nights / proposal
- Fixed applicants?
- Proposals by grad. students
- …

4th TAC members (2005.08-2007.07?)

- K. Ohta (Kyoto) chair
- S. Sasaki (NAO, Mizusawa)
- T. Nakajima (NAO, Mitaka)
- M. Hayashi (NAO, Hawaii)
- T. Shigeyama (Tokyo)
- T. Kodama (NAO, Mitaka)
- Y. Yoshii (Tokyo)
- M. Chiba (Tohoku)
- M. Umemura (Tsukuba)

Process 1

- Category =>
  8-9 groups each group includes about 20 proposals

- A-1 solar system, extra-solar system
- B-1 normal star
- B-2 star formation, ISM
- B-3 compact star, supernova, GRB
- C-1 clusters, gravitational lensing
- C-2 high-z galaxies, galaxy formation/evolution
- C-3 nearby galaxies
- C-4 AGNs/QSOs
- (C-5 deep surveys, QSO abs lines)

Process 2

- 5 referees for each group
- Usually three of them are japanese
  (staff, PDF)
- At least 4 referees review the proposal
- 5-step relative evaluation
  + 5-step absolute evaluations
- Average score
- Comments are strongly recommended

Process 3

- Assign number of nights for each group (Kaken-hi style distribution)
- TAC reviews the proposals and approve based on the referees' score (weight?)
- Considering Min night, challenge, continuation etc
- Proposals with the highest-score tend to request many nights… , so you can guess…

Process 4

- Rough time allocation
- Dark in March, April is very compete
- Technical comments from SS

Service observations

- Reviewed by TAC members (three referees for one proposal)
- 3-step evaluation
- Observations are executed based on the scores and obs conditions
- After complete your observation, the results are informed to the applicant

Problems in TAC process

- So many …
- let us know and let us discuss
  to improve the TAC process