

Organizational Framework of the Scientific Committee

Technology of Oil, Gas and Sustainable Energy Conference & Exhibition (TOGSE 2026)

Fezzan – Libya

First: General Framework and Strategic Vision

The Scientific Committee is the entity responsible for overseeing all scientific aspects of the conference and ensuring the quality of the scientific content, fairness of the peer-review process, and balance among conference tracks, in a manner that reflects the professional standards of the organizing institution and enhances the conference's position within the energy sector.

This framework is established to regulate the work of the Scientific Committee in a clear and flexible manner through defining roles and responsibilities, governing the review mechanism, and organizing the scientific tracks, thereby ensuring unified standards and centralized scientific decision-making while maintaining institutional coordination with the Organizing Committee.

The Scientific Committee adopts a strategic vision aimed at developing the conference into a reputable national scientific platform within the energy sector, linking scientific research with industrial application, strengthening the practical and applied dimensions, and supporting integration among oil, gas, and sustainable energy sectors.

Second: Purpose of the Scientific Committee

- Supervising the scientific content
- Ensuring a systematic and transparent peer-review process
- Achieving balance among conference tracks
- Supporting the energy sector across its various disciplines and enhancing integration between oil, gas, sustainable energy, and digitalization

Third: Organizational Structure

Committee Leadership

- Scientific Committee Chairman: Dr. Abdalla Ali Estuti
- Committee Rapporteur: Ahmed Abdalla Balout

Fourth : Scientific Tracks and Topics

- 1) Upstream (Exploration & Production)**
- 2) Midstream (Transportation & Processing)**
- 3) Downstream (Refining & Industries)**
- 4) Environment & Climate**
- 5) Sustainable Energy**
- 6) Digitalization & Artificial Intelligence**

Fifth: Roles and Responsibilities within the Scientific Committee

To ensure clarity of responsibilities and avoid overlap in duties, the Scientific Committee adopts the following distribution of roles within the scientific tracks:

1. Scientific Committee Rapporteur (Main Executive Role)

The Rapporteur serves as the executive coordinator of the scientific process and is responsible for the following:

- Receiving and organizing all abstracts and scientific papers submitted to the conference and conducting preliminary presentation to the Committee Chairman or his delegate to determine the appropriate track
- Distributing papers to track chairs according to approved specializations
- Monitoring the commitment of track chairs and reviewers to the approved timeline
- Ensuring continuous coordination among the various tracks to guarantee workflow efficiency
- Documenting and archiving all review results and scientific correspondence
- Preparing periodic reports and submitting them to the Scientific Committee Chairman

- Following up the implementation of Scientific Committee decisions
- Supervising the preparation of the scientific program in coordination with track chairs

Organizational Note

The Scientific Committee Rapporteur serves as the primary link between all components of the scientific process and is responsible for maintaining procedural and scheduling consistency.

2. Track Chairs (Scientific Supervisory Role)

The Track Chair assumes overall scientific responsibility for papers within the track scope, including:

- Supervising the peer-review process within the track
- Assigning papers to supporting members and supporting committee members according to specialization
- Approving reviewers from within or outside the committee
- Reviewing peer-review reports and ensuring their quality
- Handling conflicting evaluations
- Submitting justified recommendations for acceptance or rejection to the Scientific Committee Chairman
- Contributing to the preparation and organization of track scientific sessions

3. Supporting Members (Primary Review Role)

Supporting members represent the core pillar of the scientific evaluation process, with responsibilities including:

- Reviewing scientific papers within their area of specialization
- Preparing detailed and objective scientific evaluation reports
- Recommending additional reviewers when necessary
- Nominating external experts to contribute to the review process

- Supporting the Track Chair in analyzing evaluation outcomes

4. Supporting Committee Members (Auxiliary Review Role)

Supporting committee members contribute to supporting the scientific process as needed through:

- Reviewing scientific papers upon assignment
- Participating in specialized technical evaluations
- Recommending reviewers from within or outside the committee
- Supporting the track in cases of increased paper volume or specialized technical requirements

External Peer Review

The Scientific Committee adopts the principle of expanding the peer-review network through:

- Engaging specialized external reviewers when needed
- Nominating reviewers by supporting members or supporting committee members
- Approving reviewers by the Track Chair

This is intended to:

- Ensure evaluation quality
- Enhance specialization and scientific accuracy
- Strengthen the credibility of conference outputs

General Working Principles

All parties shall adhere to the following principles:

- Working collaboratively under the supervision of the Track Chair
- Commitment to the approved timeline
- Maintaining impartiality and objectivity in evaluation

- Preserving confidentiality of submitted research and information

Sixth: Scientific Peer-Review System

The Scientific Committee adopts a systematic scientific peer-review process aimed at ensuring the quality and objectivity of submitted papers. The review process shall follow one of the following systems, as determined by the Scientific Committee:

Single-Blind Peer Review

Under this system:

- The reviewer knows the identity of the author
- The author does not know the identity of the reviewer

Advantages

- Faster review procedures
- Easier reviewer selection
- Suitable for applied and industrial research

Approved Review Mechanism

The review process shall follow these procedures:

- Each scientific paper shall be assigned to at least two reviewers within the relevant specialization
- A third reviewer may be assigned in cases of:
 - Conflicting evaluations
 - The need for additional specialized opinion
- Reviewers may be selected from:
 - Scientific Committee members
 - External experts according to specialization
- Supporting members and supporting committee members shall play the primary role in evaluations

- The Track Chair shall review peer-review reports and ensure their quality
- Justified recommendations shall be submitted to the Scientific Committee Chairman

Scientific Evaluation Criteria

Scientific papers shall be evaluated based on several criteria, including:

- Originality and innovation
- Scientific methodology
- Quality of analysis and results
- Relevance to conference themes
- Practical value of the research
- Clarity of presentation and organization

Peer-Review Decisions

Peer-review outcomes shall fall under one of the following decisions:

- Accepted as submitted
- Accepted with minor revisions
- Accepted with major revisions
- Rejected

Note

No scientific paper shall be accepted until all major reviewer comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

Final Decision

- Recommendations submitted by Track Chairs shall be considered technical and justified recommendations
- The final decision regarding acceptance or rejection remains under the authority of the Scientific Committee Chairman

Peer-Review Principles

The peer-review process shall adhere to the following principles:

- Full confidentiality
- Neutrality and objectivity
- Avoidance of conflicts of interest
- Commitment to the approved timeline
- Protection of intellectual property rights

The Scientific Committee shall determine at the beginning of the conference cycle whether the adopted review system will be Single-Blind or Double-Blind, and the selected system shall remain applicable throughout the entire scientific evaluation process.

Conclusion

This organizational framework represents an integrated scientific reference for regulating the work of the Scientific Committee and enhancing the quality of the conference while strengthening its connection to the realities of Libya's oil and gas sector, particularly within desert environments and the ongoing transition toward sustainability.