

DRAFT version 1.0**Performance Review System for SCAR's Scientific Research Programmes (SRPs)****23.4.2007**

1. In 2004, the SCAR SRP Design Plans were approved by the SCAR Delegates in Bremerhaven, following independent external peer review. Suggestions for revision were reported to the Principal Investigators for adoption.
2. In 2005, the SRP Implementation Plans and Steering Committees were approved by the SCAR Executive Committee. Suggestions for revision were reported to the Principal Investigators for adoption.
3. In 2006, first results (or indications of progress with implementation) were reported to and approved by SCAR Delegates in Hobart, following evaluation by the Delegates Committee on Scientific Affairs (DCSA), using the categories in Annex 1. Suggestions for revision were reported to the Principal Investigators for adoption.
4. In 2007, reports on progress with the SRPs were provided to the Executive Committee through the SCAR Annual Report, supported by updates presented orally by the SSG Chief Officers.
5. In 2008 it is intended that independent reviews of the progress of the SRPs shall be carried out and made available to the 2008 meeting of Delegates. Three independent reviewers will be approached for each report, following the procedure used in 2004. Care will 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. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate the reports based on the criteria in Annex 1. The reports and the reviews, along with comments provided from the prior meeting of the SSGs, will be evaluated by the DCSA, which will recognise that the science performed under the umbrellas of the SRPs is organised in projects that are largely funded and reviewed nationally, and that it is the object of SCAR's review to assess if the international coordination of those national endeavours is effective and adds value. The DCSA will use the external reviews and their own judgement to rate the projects into the three categories (A, B, or C) in Annex 1, and will then report to Plenary for final approval. Delegates shall decide not only on whether or not projects should continue, but also when they should end and to what extent they should be funded. 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.

Reports on progress will be prepared by SRPs based on the listing of outputs and inputs given in Annex 2.

Annex 1. 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 (A, B, or C) as shown below.

1. Science quality.

2. Science importance/relevance/timeliness.

Guideline questions: Is the work advancing global science? What major advances in science are being significantly enhanced by this programme?

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

Guideline questions: Is the research contributing to SCAR’s Goals as listed in the Strategic Plan? Is it helping to strengthen SCAR’s structure? How significant and practical are its proposed inter-disciplinary elements proving to be?

4. Operational and Technical feasibility.

Implementation notes: Where appropriate, COMNAP will be asked to comment on those programmes having a significant logistical component.

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 is it contributing to capacity building? What are its links to international programmes outside of Antarctica?

6. Data archival and access

Guideline questions: Does the programme adequately address the issues of data archiving and data access? Are its data accessible to the wider community?

7. Public/policy profile

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

8. Value added by SCAR involvement

Guideline questions: Is SCAR’s support for the programme adding to the 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.*

Annex 2.

Reports to be prepared using the following sub-headings by SRP teams for Performance Evaluation of SRPs

3.1 Outputs/Deliverables

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

3.2 Inputs

- (a) number, gender and country of participating scientists
- (b) place 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 SCAR and external income (or in kind contribution) for project activities
- (g) expenditure on project activities