

## **Summary of TAC Policies from Other Observatories**

### **C. Carilli**

#### **1. HST** (information from web and discussions with C. O'dea):

The HST has a single annual face-to-face TAC that has 11 discipline-based panels with 9 members on each. The panel definitions are driven by proposal pressure. Each panel considers of order 100 proposals, and is given of order 100 orbits to allocate. Large proposals are considered by a separate TAC. Preliminary grades are assigned by panel prior to face-to-face. ESA-members are allotted 15% of the time. Accounting of this allocation is not considered during the TAC face-to-face, but in a subsequent meeting when the HST Director and Science Policy Division review the TAC results. The written policy allows for re-adjustment of the time allocation around this 15% number if necessary, but O'dea's experience is that it has always 'worked-out' without requiring major readjustments. Proposals have been accepted from 'non-consortium' scientists (eg. Israel or India), although this fraction has been low historically.

#### **2. Gemini** (information from various web documents):

The Gemini observatory allocates time proportionally to a number of nations, including the US, UK, and others. Separate TACs are organized by the consortium members, with scientifically ranked lists sent to the Observatory. The Observatory then has a 'merging TAC' comprised of members from the individual TACs to resolve conflicts and generate a final observing queue/list with consideration for time-equity between partners. The telescope is scheduled dynamically, so they also have to take into consideration 'stringency' requirements in these allocations. The Observatory also assigns a contact scientist for each project.

#### **3. JCMT** (information from Web/Chandler)

The JCMT has several time allocation committees. The three contributing partners, namely, the UK, Canada, and the Netherlands, all have their own time allocation committees and procedures. The time allocated to these countries is in the proportion of their financial contributions to the JCMT. There is a further time allocation committee, known as the International Time Allocation Group (ITAG), which deals with proposals from astronomers not associated with one of the partner countries. A small fraction of the observing time on the JCMT goes to these international proposals, and the time comes out of the partner countries' time allocations proportionately. The actual mechanism by which time is allocated is the following: local Time Allocation Groups (TAGs) from the UK, Canada, and the Netherlands have their own review procedures and ranking systems, and meet approximately simultaneously. The ranked lists are then combined a week or two later, during the meeting of the ITAG. At this point conflicting proposals from different countries are dealt with, and the apportionment of time according to partner country time allocations is achieved. The University of Hawaii receives 10% of the time on the JCMT. Their time allocation procedures are completely independent of the JCMT partner country TAGs and the ITAG, and there is no investigation of conflicting proposals (to my knowledge).

#### **4. ESO** telescopes (from Peter Shaver)

At ESO there is no requirement to allocate the time to the individual member-states strictly in the proportion to their contributions. Up to now the ESO members never had strong complaints about the way the available time had been allocated. As for the time available to the National telescopes (SEST...), the time allocation was always done for completely separate blocks of time in a totally separate process under the responsibility of the national institutes. That is, ESO never interfered in the scientific evaluation and selection process of these proposals. In case of time coordination problems the cooperation between ESO and the National partners always was working fine