

Procedure for Review of Beam-time Applications at the CNBC

1. Upon receipt of a Proposal, the Director ensures that a Local Contact has been assigned, checks whether or not an on-site participant has been identified and verifies that a self-assessment of hazards has been completed by the Proponents.
2. The Director forwards the Proposal to the Review Administrator
3. The Review Administrator registers the Proposal, creates an evaluation file, and informs the Local Contact that the Proposal is ready for evaluation.
4. The Local Contact contacts the primary Proponent, to :
 - a) confirm that the Proposal is complete, and suitable for review;
 - b) confirm that the experiment is feasible with existing CNBC equipment;
 - c) confirm that foreseeable hazards have been described adequately; and
 - d) (if applicable) complete an Agreement for Standard Services for any portion of beam time that will be applied to proprietary research, during the course of the planned project
5. The Local Contact informs the Review Administrator that the Proposal is:
 - a) Approved for Review of Scientific Merit because the project is technically feasible with existing CNBC equipment and there are no abnormal hazards; or
 - b) Approved for Safety Review to validate the hazard-mitigation plan, where the project is technically feasible with existing CNBC equipment, and some abnormal hazards are expected; or
 - c) Rejected because the project is not technically feasible with existing CNBC equipment, or unacceptably hazardous in the view of the Local Contact (cc primary Proponent).
6. Safety Review (if applicable) requires the Safety Authority to evaluate and refine the safety-related aspects of the Proposal, then to inform the Review Administrator of the outcome, either:
 - a) Approved for Review of Scientific Merit because the hazards are adequately mitigated; or
 - b) Rejected because the hazards cannot be mitigated adequately (cc Local Contact, who informs the primary Proponent).

When a Safety Review is undertaken, the Safety Authority may indicate that additional documentation should be attached to the Proposal prior to scheduling:

- c) Note of approval by NRU operations, to be appended by the Safety Authority; or
 - d) Radiological work assessment (RWA), to be prepared by the Local Contact (cc'ed).
7. For Review of Scientific Merit, the Review Administrator requests input from the relevant Committee Coordinator on the composition of the Review Committee for the Proposal
8. The Committee Coordinator decides on the composition of the Review Committee and informs the Review Administrator of the appropriate Reviewers, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) There shall be three (3) Reviewers, one from the CNBC and two who are not employees of NRC.
 - b) There shall be no Reviewer from the university / organization of the primary Proponent.
 - c) There shall not be two Reviewers from the same university / organization.
9. The Review Administrator distributes the Proposal to the appropriate Reviewers and the Committee Coordinator.

10. The Committee Coordinator completes a confidential report that incorporates Reviewers' comments and conclusions, and sends it to the Review Administrator to be kept on file by the CNBC. The Committee Coordinator ensures that the report includes a decision, based on a majority opinion, that the Proposal is:
 - a) Approved,
 - b) Approved on the condition that additional details are provided by the Local Contact to the Committee Coordinator,
 - c) Not approved, inviting a re-write and submission for a new review, or
 - d) Rejected.
11. The Review Administrator informs the Local Contact of the Committee's decision, and the Local Contact informs the primary Proponent.
12. If the decision is full approval (10 (a)) or full rejection (10 (d)), the Review Administrator informs the Director that the review is complete. Otherwise, the Local Contact consults with the Committee Coordinator to formulate a suitable follow-up action to disposition the Proposal into one or the other category (10 (a) or (d)).

Note: When a Proposal re-write is invited (Clause 10(c)), the Committee coordinator shall prepare a Special Report incorporating the reviewers' comments and recommendations, then transmit this report to the Local Contact to share with the primary Proponent. The primary Proponent may choose to submit a revised Proposal. This revision should be accompanied by a cover letter detailing how the reviewers' comments have been addressed. The revised Proposal, the cover letter and a copy of the Coordinator's Special Report will then be sent to the original reviewers for re-evaluation.

13. Upon notification that the Proposal has been approved by scientific peer review, the Director will verify that any required supplementary documentation, arising from a Safety Review, has been attached to the file, and then approves the Proposal for scheduling.