

# TAC report

## Subaru UM 2011

TAC Members (10A~11B)

M. Doi (Univ. of Tokyo)

Y. Ito (Kobe Univ.)

N. Kashikawa (NAOJ)

H. Kawakita (Kyoto Sangyo Univ.)

T. Murayama (Tohoku Univ.), Chair

S. Nagataki (Kyoto Univ.)

T. Onaka (Univ. of Tokyo)

K. Shimasaku (Univ. of Tokyo)

T. Totani (Kyoto Univ.)

# Review Process

Grouping 17 Categories into 9 groups ( $\sim 20 \pm 10$  proposals/group)

A-1: Solar System

**A-2: Extrasolar Planets (NEW from S10B)**

B-1: Normal Stars

B-2: Star and Planet Formation, ISM

B-3: Compact Objects and SNe,

C-1: Clusters of Galaxies, LSS, G-Lenses, Cosmological Param.

C-2: High-z Galaxies

C-3: Milky way, Local Group, Nearby Galaxies

C-4: AGN and QSO Activity, QSO Absorption lines and IGM  
(Miscellaneous)

Basically 5 referees for each group (2-3 foreign referees)

Research fields, observation/theory, recent activity...

One (or 20% fraction) UK referee for “FMOS-favored” group

# Review Process

## Selection

- TAC review

- Referee scores and comments

- Technical comments from SS

- Requested nights

- Continuation

- Bad luck proposals (bad weather)

- Challenging / high-risk high-return

- Thesis work

- International proposal fraction

- Keck/Gemini Time Exchange Program

  - (Keck I:  $\leq 2+$  Keck II:  $\leq 4$  nights, Gemini: **5-10** nights)

- Scheduling

## Service proposals

- Reviewed by TAC members (3 reviewers for each proposal)

- Carry out based on scores and sky conditions

- Rank A (high priority) / Rank B (lower priority)

# Proposal preparation...

Please carefully read "Call for Proposals"

## Application Form

**1-6 Observing Run:** "detailed" preferred/acceptable dates are helpful

**1-10 Instrument Requirements:**

Do not forget to give **filters** (S-Cam) & **number of masks** (MOIRCS/MOS)

**1-13 Observing Method and Technical Details:**

**"Sufficient information"** for checking the feasibility

## Scientific Justification

**Font size:** 10 point or larger even in the figure caption or in the reference

**Margin:** more than 15 mm at each of the four sides

**Appropriate line spacing and figure (table) size/quality:**

**Japanese translation pages:** direct and exact translation

# International Proposal

International proposals: non-Japanese PIs@non-Japanese institutions

Accepted International Proposal Fraction (night base)

S00-S06B	S07A-S09A	S09B	S10A	S10B	S11A
~10±5%	~16%	<b>27%</b>	23%	20%	15%

International nights/allocated nights by category groups

	S10B	S11A
A-1	0/4	0/5
<b>A-2</b>	<b>4/4 (=100%)</b>	<b>4/7 (=57%)</b>
B-1	} <b>3/5 (=60%)</b>	0/8
B-2		2/6 (=33%)
B-3	0/4	0/8
C-1	2/7.5	0/12
C-2	0/9	3/19
C-3	0/6	4/11
C-4	0/5.5	0/14

- Some groups have high international fractions
- Especially high in A-2 (extrasolar planet)
- Small number of the open use nights in S10B
- Group A-2 started from S10B

# S11B Schedule (plan)

mid Feb     Call for proposals  
**Mar 11**     Normal/Intensive Submission Deadline  
**Apr 8**       Service Submission Deadline  
early Jun    Report of Results to PIs  
Aug 1        S11B Starts

**(Subaru Telescope downtime: Aug[-Sept])**

Keck/Gemini exchange time will be available during  
Subaru downtime

# 共同利用ユーザーアンケートのコメント (ポスター P0)

ご回答くださったみなさま、ありがとうございました

## 審査方法について

- 十分な知識を持ったレフェリーを選んでほしい。
- 悪天候のため観測できなかった提案を再申請すると次は採択されないことがあって困る。
- レフェリーが順位をつけるほど個々の提案に差がないので、以前のようなABCのランク付けのほうがよい。
- TACもレフェリーの一人になるべき。
- 少数の学生やPDを審査の議論に加えれば公平性が保て、教育効果もある。
- もう少し倍率が下がれば各提案3人のレフェリーにしてもよい。

## 結果通知について

- もう少し早いと助かる(5)
- 外国人共同研究者に伝えられないので日本語のコメントは困る。
- これまでの出版論文数/採択プロポーザル数のような指標を作ってはどうか？
- レフェリーコメントを具体的に書いてほしい。