

## **Performance Review System for SCAR's Scientific Research Programmes (SRPs)**

### **1. In 2006**

First results (or indications of progress with implementation) shall be reported to the Delegates in Hobart in 2006. SRP leaders will use the criteria listed in Annex 1 to produce reports on progress. The SSGs meeting prior to the Delegates meeting will assist SRP leaders in preparing the reports for the Delegates.

Progress will be evaluated during the Delegates' meeting by the Delegates Committee on Scientific Affairs (DCSA), using the categories in Annex 2. The DCSA will then report to Plenary.

If revisions to direction are required, SRP leaders will be asked to present a plan for such revisions in time for its consideration by the Executive Committee in the following year.

### **2. In 2008**

Independent reviews of the progress of the SRPs shall be carried out after 3–4 years and be made available during the 2008 meeting of Delegates. Three to four reviewers will be approached for each report (\*1), and asked to evaluate the reports based on the criteria in Annex 2. Reviewers will use the reports presented at the 2006 meeting, and an update representing progress in the subsequent 2 years. COMNAP will be asked to comment on implementation where there are evident logistical implications.

As in 2006, the SSGs meeting prior to the Delegates meeting will assist SRP leaders in preparing the reports for the 2008 Delegates meeting.

Progress will be evaluated during the Delegates' meeting by the Delegates Committee on Scientific Affairs (DCSA), using the external reviews and their own judgements, to rate the projects into the categories in Annex 2. The DCSA will then report to Plenary (\*2).

If revisions to direction are required, SRP leaders will be asked to present a plan for such revisions in time for its consideration by the Executive Committee in the following year.

*\*1 It is recognised that care must be taken in choosing reviewers who are not directly involved in the programme in question, yet who are not totally uninformed about the demands of science in the Antarctic region.*

*\*2 The DCSA will recognise that the science performed under the umbrellas of the SRPs is organised in projects that are largely funded and reviewed nationally. It is the object of SCAR's review to assess if the international coordination of those national endeavours is effective and adds value.*

**Annex 1****Reports to be Prepared by SRP Teams for Performance Evaluation of SRPs****3.1 Outputs/Deliverables**

- a. Publications in peer reviewed literature (including articles “in press”)
- b. Other Publications (e.g. institution reports, articles in the grey literature, maps, atlases, CDs, Newsletters or contributions to newsletters)
- c. Brochures, posters, press/media articles and similar PR material
- d. creation of a web site, and number of hits per web site
- e. creation of database(s), and amount of use of database(s). (e.g. as measured by hits on a web version)
- f. number and type of education/training and other capacity building activities;
- g. new technology/model developments;
- h. contributions to IPY
- i. key achievements (short paragraphs on each)

**3.2 Inputs**

- a. number, gender and country of participating scientists
- b. number and type of meetings/workshops, and numbers, genders and countries represented in their attendees
- c. links to other SCAR SRPs or Action or Expert Groups
- d. links to other ICSU bodies or to other scientific groups
- e. development and staffing of a project office or other administrative support
- f. sources and amounts of income for project activities
- g. expenditure on project activities

### Evaluation criteria for SCAR Scientific Research Programmes

Delegates will consider and comment on the performance of each SRP taking into consideration the ten criteria used initially to evaluate the SRP proposals. These are listed below in order of importance together with notes on implementation of the criteria where appropriate and some guideline questions to assist in the interpretation of the criteria. Delegates will then classify each SRP into one of three categories as shown below.

**1. Science quality/proposal quality.**

*Implementation notes:* Two external international reviewers will be requested to provide comment specifically on the novelty, science quality and on the relevance and timeliness (see next section) of the proposal before the Delegates meeting so that these reviews can be made available at the DCSA discussion. The reviewers may not necessarily be part of the Antarctic science community. The Scientific Programme Planning Group that submits the plan may suggest reviewers, and may suggest names of those they do not wish to review the plan.

**2. Science importance/relevance/timeliness.**

*Implementation notes:* see above regarding external review.

*Guideline questions:* The issues to be considered here are the importance of the work in advancing global science. Among the questions to consider *inter alia* are: What are the major advances in science that will be significantly enhanced by this programme?

Will a significant delay in implementing this programme result in SCAR science falling behind in the area?

**3. “Fit” to current SCAR Strategic Plan as determined by the SCAR Delegates.**

*Guideline questions:* How closely does the research match the mission and vision of SCAR?

Does the research contribute to SCAR’s Goals as listed in the Strategic plan?

Does the research programme fit within, and strengthen SCAR’s structure?

How significant and practical are its proposed inter-disciplinary elements?

What will be the consequences to SCAR if this research is not funded?

**4. Operational and Technical feasibility.**

*Implementation notes:* It is recommended that COMNAP be asked to comment on the operational and logistic feasibility of the programme in advance of the Delegates’ Meeting so that these reviews can be made available at the DCSA discussion.

**5. Degree of international involvement/likely commitment.**

*Guideline questions:* Does the programme involve a wide array of SCAR nations?

Are less technically advantaged nations able to participate and contribute?

How does it aim to contribute to capacity building?

What are its links to international programmes outside of Antarctica?

**6. Data archival and access**

*Guideline questions:* Does the proposal adequately address the issues of data archiving and data access?

**7. Public/policy profile**

*Guideline questions:* Will this programme enhance the profile of SCAR?

**8. Value added by SCAR involvement**

*Guideline questions:* How will SCAR's support for the programme add to the likely success of the research?

**9. Education and outreach (E&O)**

*Guideline questions:* Is the work contributing to education about Antarctic science? Is communication about the programme significantly raising SCAR's public profile?

**10. International Polar Year**

*Guideline questions:* How is the programme contributing to the International Polar Year.

Based on their analysis, and consideration of external reviews if available, Delegates will evaluate the SRPs into the following categories:

- A. Excellent science in terms of quality, importance and timeliness with a good "fit" to SCAR's place in science and to SCAR's directions. IPY and outreach plans are in place, and the programme is raising SCAR's international profile. The programme is highly feasible, with international connections in place and data handling procedures evident. There may be some very minor revisions or clarifications needed, but *the programme is underway and making good progress.*
- B. Excellent science in terms of quality, importance and timeliness with a good "fit" to SCAR's place in science and to SCAR's directions. IPY, outreach, and data handling plans are in place, as are international connections. BUT there are some difficulties. Work is necessary to bring the overall standard up to the level expected. Revisions are required and should be reported to the Executive Committee in the following year for approval. *The programme is not making as good progress as expected and direction needs to be revised.*
- C. The science is not up to the standard required to justify SCAR's continued support or endorsement. The programme needs significant reworking based on the reviews provided, before resubmission to SCAR. *SCAR's funding for international coordination will be withdrawn unless the reworked and resubmitted programme meets approval at the next Delegates' meeting.*