



2nd Call for Coordinated Research

Peer Review Guide

Final version, 17.03.09

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	5
3	OBJECTIVES OF THE PEER REVIEW	5
4	INDEPENDENCE AND PAYMENT OF REVIEWERS.....	5
5	CONFIDENTIALITY AND FLOW OF COMMUNICATION	6
6	MANAGEMENT OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS	6
7	PROCEDURE.....	7
8	RELATED DOCUMENTS AND TOOLS	10
8.1	FORM TO CONFIRM AVAILABILITY AS REVIEWER	10
8.2	EVALUATION REPORT (ER).....	10
8.3	EVALUATION MODEL.....	10
8.4	EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT (ESR)	11
	ANNEX 1: SCOPE OF THE SECOND COORDINATED CALL OF SNOWMAN.....	12
	ANNEX 2: TEMPLATE FOR CONFIRMATION OF REVIEWER'S AVAILABILITY	16
	ANNEX 3: DEFINITION OF POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	17
	ANNEX 4: DECLARATION ABOUT CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS	18
	ANNEX 5: EVALUATION MODEL (GREEN ZONE, YELLOW ZONE, RED ZONE).....	19
	ANNEX 6: TEMPLATE FOR EVALUATION REPORT.....	20
	ANNEX 7: TEMPLATE FOR EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT	23

1 INTRODUCTION

SNOWMAN (**S**ustainable **ma**Nagement of **sO**il and **g**round**W**ater under the pressure of soil pollution and soil **contaMinAtioN**) was formed in 2004 as an ERA-Net (**E**uropean **R**esearch **A**rea **N**etwork) project funded by the European Commission's 6th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development.

SNOWMAN is a network of national funding organisations and administrations, providing the research funding platform for soil and groundwater, and bridging the gap between knowledge demand and supply.

In December 2006, the ERA-Net SNOWMAN launched its first coordinated call for research with a budget of almost 800,000€. Subsequently, SNOWMAN funded 6 trans-national research projects, each having a nominal 12 months duration.

In 2008, the network took the decision to prepare a second call for research which has been launched in January 2009. The projects expected to be funded by this call, which has a budget of 1.8 Mio. €, should have a duration between 12 and 36 months. Proposals may be of different types and sizes. They can be, for example, desk studies or field experiments. The funders of this second call are listed in Table 1.

The SNOWMAN ERA-Net project will come to an end, June 2009. The partners of this network have already initiated the creation of a self-funded soil and groundwater network to progress the work begun and to implement the Research Programme developed by the SNOWMAN ERA-Net.

Table 1. Call 2 funders

Organisation	Website
Bundesministerium fuer Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment & Water Management, BMLFUW - Austria)	http://www.lebensministerium.at
Agence De l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie (Agency for Environment and Energy Management – France)	www.ademe.fr
Stichting Kennisontwikkeling en Kennisoverdracht Bodem (Centre for Soil Quality and Knowledge Transfer – Netherlands)	http://www.skbodem.nl/
Openbare Vlaamse Afvalstoffenmaatschappij (Public Waste Agency of Flanders - Belgium)	http://www.ovam.be/
Naturvårdsverket (Swedish Environment Protection Agency - Sweden)	http://www.naturvardsverket.se/
Forskningsrådet (The Swedish Research Council - Sweden)	http://www.formas.se
UE FISCSU Ministry of Education, Research and Youth; Executive Agency for Higher Education and Research Funding - Romania	http://www.uefiscsu.ro

Three topic areas have been identified for the second coordinated call of SNOWMAN (see further details given in the Annex 1):

1. Area management of contamination

The main question for this area is how to shift from a site specific approach of soil remediation and management of contamination to an area-wide approach. The main reasons for this shift in approach are:

- Apart from site related sources of pollution, the management of diffuse pollutants in urban and rural areas is becoming increasingly important;
- The contamination of groundwater is spreading over larger areas because of the groundwater flow. Different sources of pollution can be mixed and remediation and management of single sources of pollution is not effective any more.

An important goal of area management of contamination is the increased cost effectiveness compared with site specific approaches.

2. Integration of soil management into spatial planning

The reason for remediation of contaminated sites can be the adaptation of existing use of sites to reduce the risk of the effects of contamination on human health and environment. More often the reason is the redevelopment of sites and changes in land use. The advantages of these situations are that economic revenues of this redevelopment or change of land use can fund remediation and management costs of contaminated land. To make use of these advantages it is necessary to coordinate and integrate management of soil quality into spatial planning.

3. Use of contaminated land for biofuel crop production

In recent years a discussion has begun about the sustainable use of rural land for food and biofuel crop production (the growing of plants to use as an energy source). The global increase of the population, the increase of welfare resulting in a considerable increase of consumption of dairy products on one hand and the enormous increase of the production of biofuels are creating a global competition in the use of rural areas for production, forestry and natural areas. This raises the question of whether contaminated areas which are not suitable for the production of food (light polluted areas) can be used for the production of biofuels.

2 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document is intended to guide the reviewers, nominated by the call 2 funders, 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 2 Steering Committee (C2SC) which is the decision-making body,
- Call 2 Coordinator (= Agence De l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie, France), which is managing the call, and
- Call Secretariat (= Federal Environment Agency, Germany) which provides administrative support to the call and manages the Peer Review process

are informed by this document about all relevant tasks within the Peer Review process.

To get an overview about the 2nd call of SNOWMAN and the funding organisations and countries who participate, the reviewers should refer to the Call 2 Applicants' Guide which can be downloaded from the SNOWMAN homepage (<http://www.snowman-era.net>).

3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PEER REVIEW

The peer review is the 3rd step of the SNOWMAN research proposal evaluation process (*1st step, realised by the Call Secretariat: eligibility check; 2nd step, realised by the call funders and the C2SC: fundability check and fit-to-call check*). All proposals the reviewers will receive from the Call Secretariat already passed the first two steps of the process. These proposals are in principle fundable by the call 2 funders and fit with their topic(s) addressed into the scope of SNOWMAN's 2nd call. The peer review is one step towards the Final Funding Recommendation by the C2SC. The Final Funding Recommendation will be carried after the peer review, so that the final recommendation can be made using advice from the whole peer review process.

The quality and relevance of the proposals will be judged by an independent, international, peer review panel, nominated by the Steering Committee. A pool of potential reviewers will be established before the start of the evaluation process, but final selection of reviewers will not be made until the applications have been received.

4 INDEPENDENCE AND PAYMENT OF REVIEWERS

The Steering Committee shall ensure that the reviewers are independent experts with the skills and knowledge appropriate to the applications they are asked to review, and that they are not faced with a conflict of interests on any matter on which they are asked to give opinion. **At the time of their appointment reviewers will be required to sign a declaration to the effect that there is no such conflict of**

interest and that they will not allow one to arise. A further definition of possible conflicts of interest is given in **Annex 3**. The template for the declaration of conflicts of interest is given in **Annex 4**.

Whether or not reviewers are paid shall be at the discretion of individual Funders, in accordance with their own national rules. If reviewers are paid, this shall be the responsibility of each national Funder, who shall also ensure peer reviewers from their own country deliver a suitable assessment by the date required.

5 CONFIDENTIALITY AND FLOW OF COMMUNICATION

Each party involved will treat the information gained in this process in confidence.

Peer review will initially be carried out remotely. Reviewers will be provided with guidance and will use an evaluation model based on the criteria given in 8.4 below. **During the peer review the reviewers may, if necessary, seek clarification of parts of the proposal from an Applicant via the Call Secretariat.**

Each peer reviewer will produce an evaluation report with comments for each of the evaluation headings, a score for each criterion, and a total score for each proposal.

Following this initial, independent step, the individual peer reviews will be shared amongst the reviewers and a moderation meeting will be convened to resolve any differences and agree final scores for each proposal. This moderation meeting will be held in Paris on May 28th and 29th 2009. These moderated final scores will be recorded by the Call Secretariat and passed to the Steering Committee, who will be responsible for funding recommendations.

Each peer reviewer will be informed of the outcome of the call. The evaluation Summary Report will be sent to the Applicants.

The flow of communication will take place as it is described in section **7 (Procedure)**.

6 MANAGEMENT OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The peer review process will be managed by the SNOWMAN Call Secretariat in close cooperation with the Call 2 Coordinator. Tasks are as follows:

- Preparation of Evaluation Report templates per proposal,
- Distribution of the research proposals and the prepared Evaluation Report templates to the selected reviewers via an online area of restricted access,
- Provision of the reviewers with additional information and support on request,
- Collecting the completed Evaluation Reports for the research proposals uploaded by the reviewers to the online restricted area,
- Organisation of the Peer Reviewers' meeting,

- Compilation of Evaluation Summary Reports for each proposal and of the results of the moderation meeting which will become the basis for the Recommendation Meeting of the Call 2 Steering Committee,
- Organisation and completion of the Call 2 Steering Committee Recommendation Meeting.

Queries:

Reviewers should send any queries about the review process via e-mail to joerg.frauenstein@uba.de with an additional copy to the Call Secretariat (secretariat@snowman-era.net). Those queries and the associated answers that are relevant for all reviewers will be circulated to all.

Contact details:

SNOWMAN Call Secretariat
 c/o Umweltbundesamt
 Mr. Arnd Wieland
 Woerlitzer Platz1
 D-06844 Dessau-Rosslau,
 Germany.
 Telephone: +49 340 2103 3026
 Fax: +49 340 2104 3026
 Homepages: <http://www.umweltbundesamt.de>
<http://www.snowman-era.net>
 Arnd Wieland secretariat@snowman-era.net
 Joerg Frauenstein joerg.frauenstein@uba.de

7 PROCEDURE

The following tasks specify the Peer Review Process in detail.

Task	Responsible partner	Involved partner	Deadline	Referenced information/ documents
Secr contacts all nominated potential reviewers and informs them about the SNOWMAN-Programme, the Peer Review Process and about the timeframe they should be available as reviewers.	Secr	Reviewer	17.03.09	<= Peer Review Guide for Call 2 <= Annex 1 (scope of the call) of Applicants Guide <= Information about schedule <= Form to confirm availability as reviewer (see 8.1)
Each reviewer fills in the form to confirm availability and sends it via fax/e-mail to Secr	Reviewer	Secr	27.03.09	=> completed form to confirm availability
Secr compiles the list of available reviewers and submits it to the C2SC	Secr	C2SC	02.04.09	=> short list of available reviewers

Secr informs C2SC members on nominated reviewers not available	Secr	C2SC	02.04.09	=> information to C2SC
Secr compiles overview of proposals received from the call and sends the information to the C2SC members	Secr	C2SC	02.04.09	=> overview of proposals received from the call
Eligibility Check	Secr	Call 2 funders via C2SC	08.04.09	=> Eligibility Check form
Secr asks funders, if they want to nominate additional reviewers after closure of the call and/or change first nominees	Secr	Call 2 funders via C2SC	09.04.09	<= information about additional reviewers / exchange of nominated reviewers
Funders contact additional reviewers and ask for availability, funders confirm to Secr additional reviewers	C2SC	Secr	23.04.09	=> updated list of available reviewers
Fundability Check	Call 2 funders	Secr	23.04.09	<= Result list regarding proposals' fundability
Fit-to-call Check	C2SC	Secr	23.04.09	<= Result list regarding proposals that fall into scope of call
C2SC telephone conference to confirm final list of peer reviewers	C2SC	Secr	27.04.09	=> final list of reviewers
Secr informs potential reviewers about final reviewer list agreed by the funders and sends the declaration about conflict of interests to the selected peer reviewers	Secr	Reviewers	28.04.09	<= final list of reviewers => declaration form about conflict of interests
The proposals will be made available via an Internet area of restricted access. Login data will be provided beforehand to the reviewers via the Call Secretariat; the Call Secretariat contacts all reviewers from the final list with an informative e-mail regarding access to this area, login, password requirements, emergency contact, etc.	Secr	Reviewers	29.04.09	=> login data for restricted area => information e-mail about area usage => contact details
Completion of Evaluation Report Templates for proposals passing all 3 Checks, distribution (together with proposals) to selected reviewers	Secr	Reviewers	30.04.09	=> Prepared Evaluation Reports for review phase
Reviewers send back the declaration about conflict of interest	Reviewers	Secr	04.05.09	<= declaration form about conflict of interests
Performing the remote peer	Reviewers	Secr	04.05.09 –	<= Evaluation Model

reviews and submitting the completed evaluation reports to Secr (uploading to restricted area)			25.05.09	
Secr receives and collects the evaluation reports of several reviewers (reviewers uploading evaluation reports to restricted area)	Secr	Reviewers	26.05.09	<= completed Evaluation Reports
Secr grants access for all evaluation reports to all reviewers for preparation purpose of the reviewers' meeting	Secr	Reviewers	27.05.09	=> Evaluation Reports accessible for all reviewers
Meeting of the peer reviewers	Reviewers	CC, Secr	28.05.09 – 29.05.09	=> improved proposal evaluation
Secr 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 Secr 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.	Secr	CC	08.06.09	=> Evaluation Summary Reports => short list
Secr submits the short list to the C2SC (by uploading on SNOWMAN restricted area) Submission of the evaluation summary reports to C2SC (by uploading on SNOWMAN restricted area)	Secr	C2SC	08.06.09	=> short list to restricted area => Evaluation Summary Reports
Call 2 funders sending national priority scoring values	Call 2 funders	Secr	11.06.09	<= national priority scoring values
Preparation of Funding Recommendation Meeting (peer review results + priority scoring)	Secr	C2SC	12.06.09	=>ranked list of proposals
Funding Recommendation Meeting of the C2SC on basis of the results of the peer review phase documented by the short list.	C2SC	Secr	15.06.09 – 16.06.09	<= short list => final funding recommendation to funders
Informing the applicants on the results by submitting the relevant evaluation summary report	CC	Applicants	> 30.06.09	=> Evaluation Summary Reports
Informing the reviewers on	CC	Reviewers	> 30.06.09	=> letter of thanks,

the results of the proposal evaluation and letter of thanks from SNOWMAN, names of reviewers to be published on SNOWMAN homepage				public online information
---	--	--	--	----------------------------------

Caption:

=>.....	output, resulting document or report
<=	input, requested document or template
C2SC.....	Call 2 Steering Committee
CC.....	Call 2 Coordinator
Secr.....	Call Secretariat, Federal Environment Agency, Germany

8 RELATED DOCUMENTS AND TOOLS

8.1 Form to confirm availability as reviewer

This form should be used by the potential reviewers to confirm or otherwise their availability for the peer review. It is included in this document as **Annex 2**.

8.2 Evaluation Report (ER)

All reviewers will be provided with the applications and project proposals and with a template for an Evaluation Report as shown in **Annex 6**. After completion of the template with the findings of their assessment the reviewers shall return the Evaluation Reports to the Call Secretariat.

8.3 Evaluation Model

The proposals will be evaluated in peer review by using the following criteria:

Criterion	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. 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.
5. 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.
6. Cost effectiveness	Cost of the proposal set against its

	relevance, significance, and scientific excellence.
7. Risk	Likelihood of success, and presence of weaknesses in any part of the proposal.

Each criterion 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 **Annex 5**, wherein the threshold scores are highlighted in yellow. Proposals failing to achieve the relevant threshold score for any criterion are likely to be excluded from further consideration.

Peer Reviewers will be provided with evaluation guidance, and a feedback sheet wherein they will be asked to record feedback commentary, and to summarise their evaluation in a score for each category.

8.4 Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)

The evaluation results per proposal and review panel will be documented in an Evaluation Summary Report (see template given in **Annex 7**) by the Call Secretariat. The Call Secretariat will average the total scores per proposal. Written comments on the assessment scores will be summarised. Each proposal will be related to the categories “offer funding”, “reserve list” or “reject” in a short list created on basis of the peer review.

ANNEX 1: SCOPE OF THE SECOND COORDINATED CALL OF SNOWMAN

I. Introduction

SNOWMAN is the ERA-NET project aiming at **Sustainable maNagement of sOil and ground Water** under the pressure of soil pollution and soil conta**Min**Atio**N**. The research areas which are identified by the SNOWMAN-partners are related to strategies and tools for sustainable management of land contamination, soil system processes and the application of related sciences and technologies. These areas formed the scope of the coordinated call for research projects launched in November 2006. 5 projects were selected in the field of (im)mobilisation of contaminants, monitored natural attenuation, management of trace element contaminated soils and tools for ecosystems impact assessment.

For the second coordinated call the management of contaminated land will again be an important area of research projects for SNOWMAN.

In this field we see a shift in interest in research from site specific remediation and management of pollution towards area management of soil and groundwater quality.

A second area of interest is formed by questions how to integrate soil quality management into spatial planning processes. The remediation of soil and groundwater and the management of contaminated soils are often combined with site redevelopment and with planning of new living or industrial areas. The quality of soil and groundwater must form a relevant item in town planning processes.

The worldwide discussion about the effects of climate change also plays a role in the research needs for land management and soil processes. This may vary from knowledge about the role of soil in the emission of greenhouse gases, the effects of climate change on soil processes and the changes in land use caused by climate change. An important effect of the production of biofuel crops is the competition in land use between food production, biofuel production, forestry and natural areas. The possibility of using contaminated land for biofuel production can contribute to this phenomenon. Because of the high priority of this issue in European discussions about soil research needs the SNOWMAN partners decided also to focus on this new issue in the next coordinated call.

The second coordinated call for research and development projects will be focussing on the following three areas:

- 1. Area management of contamination;**
- 2. Integration of soil management into spatial planning;**
- 3. Use of contaminated land for biofuel crop production.**

Proposals may be of different types and sizes. They can be, for example, desk studies or field experiments. All proposals must be less than three years duration; including submission of, revision by the researchers, and acceptance by the funders, of the final report.

II. Topics

1. Area management of contamination

The main question for this area is how to shift from a site specific approach of soil remediation and management of contamination to an area-wide approach. The main reasons for this shift in approach are:

- Apart from site related sources of pollution, the management of diffuse pollutants in urban and rural areas is becoming increasingly important;
- The contamination of groundwater is spreading over larger areas because of the groundwater flow. Different sources of pollution can be mixed and remediation and management of single sources of pollution is not effective any more.

An important goal of area management of contamination is the increased cost effectiveness compared with site specific approaches.

The following are given as examples of topics where knowledge is required but this area is not restricted to these and proposers are encouraged to develop their own questions to be answered with their research projects:

- Questions related to the management approaches:
 - How do we shift from a site specific approach to an area approach?
 - What changes does this require in the field of policy, techniques, communication?
 - Is there still a need to discriminate separate sources of pollution? What are the consequences on financing the remediation projects or management of the pollution? Are there incentives for alternative ways of financing?
 - What management strategies can be applied with multiple pollution sources?
 - Which risk assessment tools can be applied with area management of contamination?
 - Which cost/benefit analyses can be applied with area management approaches of contaminated land?
 - How can we compare the cost effectiveness of area management of pollution with other management options for regional groundwater quality management?
 - Are there methods to evaluate the effectiveness of management approaches?
 - What are the costs for management of diffuse polluted land?
 - How can we calculate the economical and societal costs for land use restrictions caused by contamination?
 - Are there methods for comparison between different investments: remediation projects/environmental projects/other societal projects?
 - Which approaches are best applied in densely and thinly populated areas?
- Questions related to the fate of pollutants:
 - What is the role of soil in reducing or immobilising contamination, especially for heavy metals? What is the fate of heavy metals in the unsaturated zone? What are the effects on the long run? Are there differences in soil type? How resilient is this capacity? Can you improve resilience or can it be destroyed?
 - Are there models for predicting the fate of contaminants on an area scale? Can we link models from a local scale to an area or a catchment scale?
 - What is the behaviour of contaminants in pathways from soil to groundwater and recipients?
 - What do we know about the fate of diffuse pollutants and emerging pollutants? (transfers to water, ecosystems, food chains, accumulation in food chain / effect modeling).
 - How can we evaluate the technologies performances, tools and methods? How can we incorporate experiences from earlier projects? How to take into account their sustainability?
 - Natural attenuation of organic compounds in groundwater: development and demonstration of microbiological tools, development of methods to determine the degradation kinetics (link with the improvement of modeling and prediction ability).

2. Integration of soil management into spatial planning

The reason for remediation of contaminated sites can be the adaptation of existing use of sites to reduce the risk of the effects of contamination on human health and environment. More often the reason is the redevelopment of sites and changes in land use. The advantages of these situations are that economic revenues of this redevelopment or change of land use can fund remediation and management costs of contaminated land. To make use of these advantages it is necessary to coordinate and integrate management of soil quality into spatial planning.

The following are given as examples of topics where knowledge is required but this area is not restricted to these and proposers are encouraged to develop their own questions to be answered with their research projects:

- Methods and approaches to incorporate sustainable land management in long term spatial planning. How can we integrate decision-making and planning?
- Which tools and methods can be applied to increase the awareness of contaminated land issues in spatial planning (how to avoid problems with contaminated land, how to keep record of where contamination can be found etc.)? How to make policy makers and developers more responsible in carrying out actions that may affect existing contamination plumes?
- Which tools can be applied to facilitate the flow of information between soil quality management and spatial planning?
- Questions related to exploiting urban areas (economic consequences of using strict guideline values, diffuse pollution in urban areas)
- How can we incorporate economic value of soil functions into spatial planning decisions? Are there tools for cost/benefit analyses?
- Best practice for administration of contaminated areas (both remediated and not remediated)?
- How do we assess the performance of remediation techniques in respect of objectives for the land use under spatial planning?
- How can we prevent urban spoil and consumption of green areas?
- Which bottlenecks do we still see in redevelopment of urban and industrial areas?

3. Use of contaminated land for biofuel crop production

In recent years a discussion has begun about the sustainable use of rural land for food and biofuel crop production (the growing of plants to use as an energy source). The global increase of the population, the increase of welfare resulting in a considerable increase of consumption of dairy products on one hand and the enormous increase of the production of biofuels are creating a global competition in the use of rural areas for production, forestry and natural areas. This raises the question of whether contaminated areas which are not suitable for the production of food (light polluted areas) can be used for the production of biofuels.

The following are given as examples of topics where knowledge is required but this area is not restricted to these and proposers are encouraged to develop their own questions to be answered with their research projects:

- Is it technically and economically feasible to produce biofuels or other valuable plants on contaminated lands? What type of crops can be used? What type of contaminants situation can it be applied to? What are results of studies and experiments with biofuel production on contaminated land?
- Can we combine phyto-remediation with biofuel production? What are the barriers and how can we improve the combination? What efficiency can we expect from the phyto-remediation process? Will it be a long lasting efficiency (no reversible

phenomena)? Are there potential transfers towards the trophic chain or the food chain?

- Does the plant contamination allow its use for energy? What type of energy production is suitable and will there be a need for technical adjustments because of the contaminants? Do we need specific valorization units (ex.: boiler with a specific gas treatment)?

We also would like to refer you to the final report of the SUMATECS project (Universitaet fuer Bodenkultur Wien (BOKU), Dr. Markus Puschenreiter (project coordinator) et. al., 23.12.2008; download address for this report: http://www.snowman-era.net/content.php?horiz_link=12&vert_link=0) financed by SNOWMAN's first call. The results of this project should be considered as a guideline for future research activities and in that sense, research needs or reasons for hindrance, related to this topic, are named there. These can be used as input for your research project.

ANNEX 2: TEMPLATE FOR CONFIRMATION OF REVIEWER'S AVAILABILITY
**Form to confirm availability for the peer review phase of
SNOWMAN's Call 2**

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

- I will be able to support the 2nd SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call as reviewer. I accept the rules of the 2nd SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call. **If I am in the final list of peer reviewers, I especially commit myself to send my evaluation report(s) by May 26th 2009 and to take part in the moderation meeting which will be held in Paris in May 28th -29th 2009.**

- I will **not** be able to support the 2nd SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call as reviewer.

Date:	
Signature:	

Please fax/e-mail this form by **27. March 2009** to:

SNOWMAN Call Secretariat
 c/o Umweltbundesamt
 Arnd Wieland,
 Fax Number: +49 340 2104 3026
 E-Mail: secretariat@snowman-era.net

Thank you very much for your assistance!

Arnd Wieland
 SNOWMAN Call Secretariat

ANNEX 3: DEFINITION OF POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A conflict of interest is considered to arise in the following cases:

- The issue concerns the peer reviewer or someone close to the peer reviewer, or if the outcome of the matter can be expected to entail particular benefit or damage for the peer reviewer or anyone close to the peer reviewer.
- The peer reviewer or someone close to the peer reviewer is the deputy or is active at the same university department or company as the applicant, or is deputy for someone else who can be expected to receive particular benefit or damage from the matter's outcome.
- The peer reviewer has an ongoing or recently concluded close collaboration with the applicant.
- Reasons for conflicts of interest may also exist if there is any particular circumstance that can affect confidence in a peer reviewer's impartiality in the matter. Examples might be friendship, enmity and economic dependency.

Peer reviewers are obliged to ensure that conflicts of interest will not arise, and to declare on their own initiative if there are circumstances that might be considered to influence their standpoint. In the event of a conflict of interest, the peer reviewer shall refrain from participating in the administration and assessment of the application in question, and shall leave the room when discussions regarding the application take place. During panel meetings, minutes concerning conflicts of interest shall be kept.

ANNEX 4: DECLARATION ABOUT CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS

**Declaration about conflicts of interest
for the peer review phase of SNOWMAN's Call 2**

Name of Reviewer:	
Organisation:	

- I hereby declare that I'm not faced with a conflict of interests on any matter on which I'm asked to give opinion and that I will not allow one to arise. I will keep all information regarding the Call 2 proposals and Call 2 review process, as well as the decisions taken at the reviewers' meeting, confidential.

-
- I'm faced with a conflict of interests and I will **not** be able to support the 2nd SNOWMAN Coordinated Research Call as reviewer.

Date:	
Signature:	

Please fax/e-mail this form by **4. May 2009** to:

SNOWMAN Call Secretariat
 c/o Umweltbundesamt
 Arnd Wieland,
 Fax Number: +49 340 2104 3026
 E-Mail: secretariat@snowman-era.net

**It is essential to send a copy of your e-mail to the Call Secretariat also to:
 Mr. Jörg Frauenstein, joerg.frauenstein@uba.de**

Thank you very much for your assistance!

Arnd Wieland
 SNOWMAN Call Secretariat

ANNEX 5: EVALUATION MODEL (GREEN ZONE, YELLOW ZONE, RED ZONE)

SCORE	Scientific & Technological Excellence	Ability to carry out proposal / quality of consortium	Ability to ensure efficient management	European Added Value	Quality of dissemination plan	Cost Effectiveness	Risk
Excellent (5)	Exceptional scientific merit and originality, expected to have major scientific impact, top 5%	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	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. Excellent balance between the costs and the work proposed.	There is little or no risk that the project will fail to achieve its objectives
Very Good (4)	At the forefront of the field, will advance understanding – top 25%	Good quality consortium with some 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	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. Very good balance between the costs and the work proposed.	There is a low risk that the project will fail to deliver its objectives
Good (3)	Competitive science – top 50%	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).	Demonstrates some European added value,	Good provision for the management of knowledge and IPR. Dissemination plan partially addresses target audiences	Good value for money. Good balance between the costs and the work proposed.	There is a medium risk that the project will fail to deliver its objectives
Fair (2)	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	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. Fair balance between the costs and the work proposed-	
Poor (1)	Limited new knowledge, does not advance the field significantly		Management proposal is significantly lacking in a number of areas (structure, integration, PM quality)		Dissemination by publication in scientific press only		
Unacceptable (0)	Scientific approach flawed or repetitious	Unlikely to deliver	Unlikely to adequately support the project	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

ANNEX 6: TEMPLATE FOR EVALUATION REPORT
EVALUATION REPORT

Proposal No: SN-02/...
Call 2: SNOWMAN 2009

ACRONYM

Long Title of Proposal

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:

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

Appropriate Topic:

- Topic 1: Area management of contamination
 Topic 2: Integration of soil management into spatial planning
 Topic 3: Use of contaminated land for biofuel crop production

CONCLUSION:

Overall remarks	Averaged total score (on 5):

Proposal failed to achieve relevant threshold score for any criterion	Yes / No

Failed criteria

Recommended for consideration?

Date:	
Name of reviewer:	
Organisation:	

ABSTRACT:

Copied from proposal by Call Secretariat.

EVALUATION:

- 0 = Unacceptable
 - 1 = Poor
 - 2 = Fair
 - 3 = Good
 - 4 = Very good
 - 5 = Excellent
- (half marks may be given)

1. Scientific and technological excellence (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
2. Ability to carry out the proposal / quality of consortium (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
3. Ability to ensure the efficient management (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
4. European Added Value (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
5. Quality of dissemination plan (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
6. Cost effectiveness (Threshold 3; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Score
7. Risk	Score

(Threshold 2; Weight 1)	
<i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	

ANNEX 7: TEMPLATE FOR EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT
EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

Proposal No: SN-02/...
Call 2: SNOWMAN 2009

ACRONYM

Long Title of Proposal

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY:

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

Appropriate Topic:

- Topic 1: Area management of contamination**
- Topic 2: Integration of soil management into spatial planning**
- Topic 3: Use of contaminated land for biofuel crop production**

CONCLUSION

Overall remarks	Total score
Thresholds: 1. Averaged total score (on 5) 2. At least 50% of the single review results ≥ 4	

Proposal failed to achieve relevant threshold score for any criterion	Yes / No
Failed criteria	

Recommendation overview	Yes / No
All reviewers recommend proposal to be kept in process	
All reviewers recommended rejection of proposal from further process	
“Unbalanced” evaluation results (signal for necessary discussion at reviewers’ meeting)	

Recommended for consideration?

Date:	
Call Secretariat:	Federal Environment Agency, Germany

ABSTRACT:

Copied from proposal by Call Secretariat.

EVALUATION:

- 0 = Unacceptable
- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very good
- 5 = Excellent
- (half marks may be given)

1. Scientific and technological excellence (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score
2. Ability to carry out the proposal / quality of consortium (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score
3. Ability to ensure the efficient management (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score
4. European Added Value (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score
5. Quality of dissemination plan (Threshold 4; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score
6. Cost effectiveness (Threshold 3; Weight 1) <i>(Explanatory statement of the mark set by reviewer)</i>	Average Score

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