



## **SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call**

### **Sustainable Management of Soil and Groundwater Pollution**

#### **Peer Review Guide**

# Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Purpose of this Document .....	5
3	Objectives of the Peer Review.....	5
4	Confidentiality and Flow of Communication.....	5
5	Management of the Peer Review Process .....	6
6	Procedure.....	7
7	Connected Documents and tools.....	9
7.1	Table to name potential reviewers.....	9
7.2	Form to confirm availability as reviewer.....	10
7.3	Evaluation Report (ER).....	11
7.4	Evaluation Model .....	15
7.5	Evaluation Summary Report (ESR).....	17

## 1 INTRODUCTION

SNOWMAN (**S**ustainable ma**N**agement of s**O**il and ground**W**ater under the pressure of soil pollution and soil conta**M**in**A**tion) is a network of European research funders and administrations, working together to coordinate their efforts in the field of soil contamination and its management. The consortium is funded by the European Commission's 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development.

It consists of seven partner organisations whose website homepages are:

*Table 1. SNOWMAN Partner Homepages*

Organisation	Website
Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment & Water Management, BMLFUW - Austria)	<a href="http://www.lebensministerium.at">http://www.lebensministerium.at</a>
Agence De l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie (Agency for Environment and Energy Management - France);	<a href="http://www.ademe.fr">www.ademe.fr</a>
Umweltbundesamt (Federal Environment Agency – Germany);	<a href="http://www.umweltbundesamt.de">http://www.umweltbundesamt.de</a>
Stichting Kennisontwikkeling en Kennisoverdracht Bodem (Centre for Soil Quality and Knowledge Transfer – Netherlands)	<a href="http://www.skbodem.nl/">http://www.skbodem.nl/</a>
Environment Agency (UK)	<a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/</a>
Openbare Vlaamse Afvalstoffenmaatschappij (Public Waste Agency of Flanders - Belgium)	<a href="http://www.ovam.be/">http://www.ovam.be/</a>
Naturvårdsverket (Swedish Environment Protection Agency - Sweden)	<a href="http://www.naturvardsverket.se/">http://www.naturvardsverket.se/</a>

The consortium has launched a transnationally coordinated research call in the field of "Sustainable Management of Soil and Groundwater Pollution". The anticipated budget of this call is up to € 700,000, and projects will have a duration of up to 12 months. Up to € 100,000 will be available in each partner country from the SNOWMAN funders, plus any additional third party funding which research consortia are able to attract.

Four topic areas have been identified for the SNOWMAN coordinated call:

### 1. Principles of Sustainable Management of Land Contamination

This topic aims to achieve a better understanding of the meaning of Sustainable Land Management in practice. It will deliver guidance for regulators across Europe for the development and implementation of Sustainable Management of Land Contamination in urban and rural areas, with reference to contamination issues. It should identify more specifically the research needed for the delivery of Sustainable Land Management in the future.

## 2. Soil System Processes

This topic is focused upon soil processes, taking a wider perspective than has traditionally been the case in remediation studies. The attenuation of pollutants over space and time, the impacts of attenuation processes on soil functions and microbial diversity, and therefore the relationship between the functioning of soil as a system and land use pressures should be considered.

## 3. Tools for Sustainable Land Management

In many countries tools have been developed for sustainable land management. For example, in the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, Canada and U.S.A., tools to assess the environmental impact of soil remediation have been developed. This topic is aimed at the development and promotion of decision support tools which support sustainable approaches, and therefore the promotion of best practice in Sustainable Land Management.

## 4. Application of Sciences & Technology

This topic is dedicated to encouraging the application of scientific knowledge and new contaminated land technologies. What new techniques are available for contaminated soil and groundwater treatment, and how sustainable is each approach? Can we identify and encourage the use of more sustainable approaches?

## 2 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document is intended to guide the reviewers through the peer review process and provide all relevant information and forms to run through it effectively and efficiently.

Additionally all involved parties, such as

- Call Steering Committee (CSC) which is the decision making body
- Secretariat (= Federal Environment Agency, Germany) which provides administrative support to the call
- Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH (KPC) which manages the Peer Review Process

will be informed by this document about all relevant tasks within the Peer Review Process.

To get an overview about the whole SNOWMAN-Programme it would be useful for the reviewers to know the Applicants Guide and other available documents which can be downloaded at <http://www.snowman-era.net>.

## 3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PEER REVIEW

The 3<sup>rd</sup> step of the evaluation process (*1<sup>st</sup> step: eligibility check, 2<sup>nd</sup> step: remit check and proposal scope check*) in the Peer Review is on the way to the final funding decision. Therein the quality and relevance of the proposals will be judged by an independent, international Peer Review panel nominated by the Call Steering Committee. The Peer Review will provide scientific advice for the Call Steering Committee, which will be useful in developing and reaching the final funding decision.

## 4 CONFIDENTIALITY AND FLOW OF COMMUNICATION

Each party involved will treat all the information gained in this process as confidential. In particular the reviewers are not allowed to contact the applicants or each other during or after the peer review. Questions that may occur during the evaluation process should be directed to the applicants via the Secretariat.

The flow of communication will take place as it is described under point 6 (Procedure).

## 5 MANAGEMENT OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The peer review process will be managed by Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH (KPC), Vienna, which will be involved in this project as subcontractor of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment & Water Management (BMLFUW).

Following tasks will be managed by KPC:

- Preparation of specific, partly pre-filled Evaluation Reports per proposal;
- Distribution of the proposals among the selected reviewers and the prepared specific Evaluation Reports;
- Provide the reviewers with additional requested information and support;
- Collect all Evaluation Reports about the several proposals;
- Creation of Evaluation Summary Reports per proposal which will be the fundament for the final funding decision of the Call Steering Committee.

### Contact details:

Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH (KPC),  
Türkenstraße 9,  
1092 Vienna,  
Austria.

Telephone: +43 1 31631-0

Fax: +43 1 31631-99291

[www.publicconsulting.at](http://www.publicconsulting.at)

Werner Gargitter Ext. 291

[w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at](mailto:w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at)

Christof Skala Ext. 350

[c.skala@kommunalkredit.at](mailto:c.skala@kommunalkredit.at)

### Queries:

Reviewers should send queries about the review process via e-mail to [w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at](mailto:w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at). Those queries that are relevant for all reviewers will be sent to all reviewers.

## 6 PROCEDURE

The following tasks specify the Peer Review Process in detail.

Task	Responsible partner	Involved partner	Referenced information/ documents
Each CSC-member names 5 potential reviewers by filling in contact information as required in the table and submits the filled table via e-mail to KPC	CSC	KPC	<= table to name potential reviewers (see 7.1)
KPC contacts all named potential reviewers (35) and informs them about the SNOWMAN-Programme, the Peer Review Process and about the timeframe they should be available as reviewer.	KPC	Reviewer	<= Peer review Guide <= Annex 1 of Applicants Guide <= Information about schedule <= Form to confirm availability as reviewer (see 7.2)
Each reviewer fills in the form to commit availability and sends it via fax or scanned via e-mail to KPC	Reviewer	KPC	=> filled in form to commit availability
KPC compiles the list of available reviewers and submits it to CSC via Secretariat	KPC	CSC Secretariat	=> short list of available reviewers
CSC approves the peer review panels per "fit to call" proposal and communicates them to KPC	CSC	KPC	=> Peer review Panels
KPC pre-fills general information (e.g. acronym, costs,...) and an abstract of each proposal into the evaluation report templates	KPC		<= evaluation report template (see 7.3) => pre-filled evaluation report templates
KPC distributes the proposals and the pre-filled evaluation report templates to the selected peer reviewers via e-mail	KPC	Reviewers	<= proposals <= pre-fill evaluation report templates
Performing the remote peer reviews and submitting the filled evaluation reports to KPC	Reviewers	KPC (helpdesk)	<= evaluation model (see 7.4)
KPC receives and collects the evaluation reports of several reviewers	KPC	Reviewers	=> filled evaluation reports
KPC prepares evaluation summary reports per proposal and a short list with ranking of the proposals The ranking will be divided into 3 classes: 1st: offer funding 2nd: reserve list 3rd: rejects  KPC will also highlight those criteria, in which the evaluation of each proposal led to "red zone" scores. Red zone scores are those, that are marked red in the evaluation model.	KPC		=> evaluation summary reports (see 7.5) => short list

KPC submits the short list to CSC via Secretariat (uploading on SNOWMAN Website, restricted area)	KPC	CSC Secretariat	
Having the final funding decision meeting on basis of the results of the peer review results documented in the short list.	CSC	Secretariat, KPC	<= short list => final funding decision
Submitting the evaluation summary reports to SNOWMAN Secretariat (uploading on SNOWMAN Website, restricted area)	KPC	Secretariat	<= evaluation summary reports
Informing the applicants on the results by submitting the relevant evaluation summary report	Secretariat	Applicants	=> evaluation summary reports

## Legend:

=>..... output, resulting document or report  
 <= ..... input, requested document or template  
 CSC..... Call Steering Committee  
 KPC..... Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH  
 Secretariat..... Federal Environment Agency, Germany

## 7 CONNECTED DOCUMENTS AND TOOLS

### 7.1 Table to name potential reviewers

This table should be used by the CSC members to name the potential reviewers.

#### TABLE TO NAME POTENTIAL REVIEWERS

Name of CSC-Member:	
Country:	
Date:	

These are the potential reviewers for proposals with involvement of partners from our country:

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5
Name:					
Organisation:					
Function:					
Key Qualification					
Address:					
Phone Number:					
Fax Number:					
E-mail:					
Homepage:					

Please send this filled table until 31 December 2006 via e-mail to KPC, Werner Gargitter ([w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at](mailto:w.gargitter@kommunalkredit.at)).

Thank you!  
Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH

## 7.2 Form to confirm availability as reviewer

This form should be used by the potential reviewers to confirm or to refuse their availability in the peer review.

### Form to confirm availability in the SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call

Name of Reviewer:	
Organisation:	
Function:	
Key Qualification	
Address:	
Phone Number:	
Fax Number:	
E-mail:	
Homepage:	

I will be able to support the 1<sup>st</sup> SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call as reviewer. I will accept the rules of the 1<sup>st</sup> SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call (in particular confidentiality and conflict of interest).

-----  
 I will **not** be able to support the 1<sup>st</sup> SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call as reviewer.

Date:	
Signature:	

Please fax this form until **22 January 2007** to:

Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH  
 Werner Gargitter,  
 Fax Number: +43 1 31631-99291

Thank you!  
 Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH

### **7.3 Evaluation Report (ER)**

The reviewers will be provided with the applications and project proposals and with a template for an Evaluation Report as shown below. This template will already contain all general information and an abstract of the proposal (filled in by KPC). After filling in the findings of their assessment the reviewers will return the Evaluation Reports to KPC.

## EVALUATION REPORT

Proposal No:  
Call: SNOWMAN 2006

### ACRONYM

Long Title of Proposal

#### PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:

N°	Proposers name	Country	Total Costs (€)	%	Money Requested (€)	%
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
<b>Total</b>						

#### Appropriate Topic:

- Topic 1: Principles of Sustainable Management of Land Contamination
- Topic 2: Soil System Processes
- Topic 3: Tools for Sustainable Land Management
- Topic 4: Application of Sciences & Technology

#### CONCLUSION:

Overall remarks (Threshold: 28/40)	Total score:

Recommended for consideration?

Date:	
Name of reviewer:	
Organisation:	

**ABSTRACT:**

*Filled in by KPC*

**EVALUATION:**

- 0 = No score due to missing/incomplete information
  - 1 = Poor
  - 2 = Fair
  - 3 = Good
  - 4 = Very good
  - 5 = Excellent
- (half marks may be given)

<b>1. Scientific and technological excellence and degree of innovation</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>2. Ability to carry out the proposal successfully</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>3. Ability to ensure the efficient management of the work</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>4. Relevance to the objectives of the call</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>5. European added value</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>6. Quality of the plan for using and disseminating the knowledge</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>7. Cost effectiveness</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

<b>8. Risk</b> (Threshold 2/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

## 7.4 Evaluation Model

The proposals will be evaluated in Peer Review by using the following criteria:

Criteria	Judgement based upon
1. Scientific and technological excellence and degree of innovation	Judgement of the quality of the project idea, its objectives, overall project description, and workpackage descriptions.
2. Ability to carry out the proposal successfully, assessed in terms of resources and competencies of project team	Quality of the project team (CV's of key personnel), availability of suitable resources (sufficient critical mass of resources mobilised)
3. Ability to ensure the efficient management of the work, including the organisational arrangements laid down by the participants	Quality of project management workpackage, previous project management experience of the coordinators team.
4. Relevance to the objectives of the call and significance of contribution to the call work area	Alignment of the proposal objectives to those of the call, and peer review assessment of the significance of the work.
5. European added value	Judgement of the synergies between the partners, and the degree of transnationality of the outputs. To what extent can the outputs be achieved only through transnational collaboration.
6. Quality of the plan for using and disseminating the knowledge, potential for promoting innovation, and clarity of plans for the management of intellectual property.	Judgement of the quality of the dissemination and exploitation plan.
7. Cost effectiveness	Cost of the proposal set against its relevance, significance, and scientific excellence.
8. Risk	Likelihood of success, and presence of weaknesses in any part of the proposal.

Each of the criteria above will be subject to evaluation on a scale of 0 to 5, where a score of 0 indicates an unacceptable response and 5 an excellent one. Definitions of each level are given in the table below, wherein the threshold scores are highlighted in yellow. Proposals failing to achieve the threshold scores may be excluded from further consideration, at the discretion of the Call Steering Committee.

Peer Reviewers will be provided with evaluation guidance (Evaluation Model) and a feedback sheet (Evaluation Report ER) wherein they will be asked to record feedback commentary, and to summarise their evaluation in a score for each criterion.

Beside the thresholds for each criterion (according to the evaluation model within the green and yellow zone), there exists a threshold for the total of the scores, which is more or equal 28. This total threshold is relevant for those proposals that fall into the red zone of the evaluation model a few times.

# EVALUATION MODEL

(green zone, yellow zone, red zone)

CRITERIA (line) SCORE (column)	1. Scientific & Technological Excellence	2. Ability to carry out proposal / quality of consortium	3. Ability to ensure efficient management	4. Relevance to objectives of the call	5. European Added Value	6. Quality of dissemination plan	7. Cost Effectiveness	8. Risk
<b>Excellent (5)</b>	Exceptional scientific merit and originality, expected to have major scientific impact	High quality consortium with excellent complementarity, well suited to the tasks envisaged	Organisational structure well matched to the complexity of the project, integration of work is ensured, project management is of high quality	Completely aligned with SNOWMAN's objectives and likely to deliver beyond SNOWMAN's expectations	Clear added value, offering a significant insight into national and European level initiatives	Excellent provision for the management of knowledge and IPR. Dissemination plan proactively addresses all target audiences, some of whom are part of the consortium.	Excellent value for money. A significant part of the cost (>40%) is borne by third party funding or in kind input.	There is little or no risk that the project will fail to achieve its objectives
<b>Very Good (4)</b>	At the forefront of the field, will advance understanding	Good quality consortium with some complementarity, Suited to the tasks envisaged.	Organisational structure well matched to the complexity of the project, integration of work is ensured, project management is of high quality	Completely aligned with SNOWMAN's objectives	Clear added value, taking account of research at national level and under European initiatives.	Good provision for the management of knowledge and IPR. Dissemination plan proactively addresses all target audiences.	Very good value for money. Some of the project cost is borne by third party funding or in kind input	There is a low risk that the project will fail to deliver its objectives
<b>Good (3)</b>	Competitive science	Consortium able to deliver the work, but some minor lack of complementarity	Management proposal is generally good but lacks quality in one aspect (structure, integration, PM quality).	Aligned with SNOWMAN's objectives	Demonstrates some European added value,	Good provision for the management of knowledge and IPR. Dissemination plan partially addresses target audiences	Good value for money but no third party funding or inkind input.	There is a medium risk that the project will fail to deliver its objectives
<b>Fair (2)</b>	Fair quality science but not leading edge, modest advance	Consortium lacking in significant areas which may impair progress on aspects of the project	Management proposal is adequate	Partially aligned with SNOWMAN's objectives	Limited european added value, with a failure to relate to national or european initiatives in some parts of the project.	Dissemination plan is directed towards scientific /technical audiences only	Fair value for money with no third party input	
<b>Poor (1)</b>	Limited new knowledge, does not advance the field significantly		Management proposal is significantly lacking in a number of areas (structure, integration, PM quality)	Limited alignment with SNOWMAN objectives		Dissemination by publication in scientific press only	Poor value for money with no third party input	There is a high risk that the project will fail to achieve its objectives
<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>	Scientific approach flawed or repetitious	Unlikely to deliver	Unlikely to adequately support the project	Not aligned with SNOWMAN's priorities	No European Added Value	No dissemination plan given	Unacceptably high costs for the work proposed.	There is an unacceptably high risk that the project will fail to deliver its objectives

## **7.5 Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)**

The evaluation results per proposal and review panel will be documented in an Evaluation Summary Report (see template below) by KPC. The single results of the reviewers will be documented there. Additionally the scores of each reviewer will be averaged. KPC will summarise the written comments on the assessment scores and will recommend the proposals on basis of the peer review on a short list as “offer funding”, “reserve list” and “reject”.

## EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

Proposal No:  
Call: SNOWMAN 2006

### ACRONYM

Long Title of Proposal

#### PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:

N°	Proposers name	Country	Total Costs (€)	%	Money Requested (€)	%
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
<b>Total</b>						

#### Appropriate Topic:

- Topic 1: Principles of Sustainable Management of Land Contamination
- Topic 2: Soil System Processes
- Topic 3: Tools for Sustainable Land Management
- Topic 4: Application of Sciences & Technology

#### CONCLUSION

Overall remarks	Total score
Thresholds: 1. Total of the averages per criterion $\geq 28$ 2. At least 50% of the single review results $\geq 28$	

Number of "red zone" scores (according to the evaluation model):

Crit 1:	Crit 2:	Crit 3:	Crit 4:	Crit 5:	Crit 6:	Crit 7:	Crit 8:

Recommended for consideration?

Date:	
Organisation:	Kommunalkredit Public Consulting GmbH, Vienna

**ABSTRACT:**

--

**EVALUATION:**

0=No score due to missing/incomplete Information  
 1=Poor  
 2=Fair  
 3=Good  
 4=Very good  
 5=Excellent  
 (half marks may be given)

<b>1. Scientific and technological excellence and degree of innovation</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>2. Ability to carry out the proposal successfully</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>3. Ability to ensure the efficient management of the work</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>4. Relevance to the objectives of the call</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>5. European added value</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>6. Quality of the plan for using and disseminating the knowledge</b> (Threshold 4/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>7. Cost effectiveness</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	

<b>8. Risk</b> (Threshold 2/5; Weight 1)	<b>Score</b>
Average	
(Explanatory statements of the marks set by reviewers)	