

SNIC:s riktlinjer för granskare (SNIC 2018/34)

SNIC Guidelines for Scientific and Technical Review

Established 2022-05-02

The SNIC review guide is intended for reviewers who perform scientific and technical reviews for SNIC.

This document is maintained and updated as deemed necessary by the SNIC director.

Contents

1	Grant administrering organisation.....	2
2	Conflicts of interest.....	2
3	Roles	2
3.1	Responsibilities for the SNAC Chairman	2
3.2	Responsibilities for the SNAC Vice Chairman	2
3.3	Responsibilities for SNAC members	3
3.4	External reviewers.....	3
3.5	SNAC Working Group	3
3.6	SNAC Working Group Chairman.....	4
3.7	SNIC National User Support.....	4
3.8	Responsibilities for the SNAC Secretary.....	4
4	Review	4
4.1	Process for SNAC (scientific review).....	4
4.2	Process for SNAC wg (technical review)	5
4.3	Confidentiality.....	5
4.4	How to do a review in SUPR.....	6
4.5	Working with SUPR	6
4.6	Reading proposals and writing reviews.....	6
5	The allocation meeting	7
5.1	Sifting	7
5.2	Review of proposals handled at the allocation meeting.....	7
5.3	Priority	8
6	Criteria and grading scale	8
6.1	Scientific review.....	8
6.2	Technical review	10
7	Decision	14

1 Grant administering organisation

The Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing, SNIC, is a national research infrastructure that makes available large-scale high-performance computing resources, storage capacity, and advanced user support, for researchers affiliated with Swedish Higher Education Institutions.

2 Conflicts of interest

SNIC reviewers should observe the Swedish Research Council policy regarding conflicts of interest, VR Ref. No 113-2014-1792. SNIC reviewers may not review proposals submitted by applicants working for SNIC at the same SNIC party.

3 Roles

3.1 Responsibilities of the SNAC Chairman

- Chair SNAC and SNAC wg meetings within the rounds SNIC Large Compute and Storage.
- Appoint reviewers, after consultation with the SNAC wg, for the rounds SNIC Large Compute and Storage.
- Prepare timelines for the rounds SNIC Large Compute and Storage, in cooperation with the SNAC secretary.
- Pursue scientific evaluation and rank the applications, based upon the SNIC evaluation criteria for allocations, as described in this document, within the rounds Large Compute and Storage.
- Nominate SNAC members and, when necessary, suggest changes to SNAC.
- Assist the SNIC Office and the SNIC Board with questions regarding SNAC.
- Follow up questions from applicants as needed.

The SNAC Chairman is elected for three years by the SNAC members.

3.2 Responsibilities for the SNAC Vice Chairman

- Chair SNAC meetings when the full chairman should not participate due to conflict of interest or other reasons.
- Chair SNAC wg meetings when the full chairman is unable to attend.
- Attend SNAC wg distance meetings.
- Pursue scientific evaluation and rank the applications, based upon the SNIC evaluation criteria for allocations, as described in this document, within the rounds Large Compute and Storage.
- Assist the full chairman as needed.
- Follow up questions from applicants as needed.
- Keep up to date with the tasks to be able to replace the full chairman as needed.

The SNAC Vice Chairman is elected for three years by the SNAC members.

3.3 Responsibilities for SNAC members

- Participate in meetings relevant to SNAC
- Pursue scientific evaluation and rank the applications, based upon the SNIC evaluation criteria for allocations, as described in this document, within the rounds Large Compute and Storage.
- Presenting proposals for discussion at the Allocation Meeting and summarising the SNAC Board's final statement following the meeting.
- As soon as possible, make the SNAC Chairman aware of any conflict of interest that may affect the impartial assessment of the applications the member has been conferred (*anmäla jäv*). In the event of any doubt, the SNAC Chairman should be consulted.
- Keep your contact details up-to-date in SUPR, so the SNIC Office and the SNAC Chairman can contact you.

SNAC members are appointed for three years by the SNIC Board, with the possibility of an extension.

The SNAC members are entitled to reimbursement for their contributions.

3.4 External reviewers

An external reviewer is a person who reviews grant applications on behalf of SNAC but who is not an appointed SNAC member.

External reviewers should preferably be international subject specialists.

External reviewers are entitled to reimbursement for their contributions.

3.5 SNAC Working Group

Several experts are associated with SNAC. These experts are appointed among employees of the SNIC consortium members based on technical expertise.

The responsibilities of SNAC wg are:

- Provide SNIC with relevant information about computational and storage resources available in SNIC Rounds.
- Pursue relevant administrative duties relating to technical evaluation of SNIC Rounds.
- Participate in meetings relevant to SNAC wg.
- Assist the SNAC Chairman in appointing reviewers for the calls SNIC Large Compute and Storage.
- Pursue technical evaluation as described in this document for all SNIC Rounds.
- Make the SNAC Chairman aware of conflicts of interest concerning the evaluation of applications (*anmäla jäv*).

All SNAC wg members can do technical evaluation of all rounds, where applicable. The active SNAC wg subgroup, as defined below, may assign Application experts as review takers for Small and Medium rounds.

The SNIC consortium members get paid for providing personnel for SNAC wg.

3.6 SNAC Working Group Chairman

One SNAC wg-member takes on the role of chairman, who coordinates the group and leads the common resource assignment process. The chairman should have a good overview, organise meetings as necessary, and ensure that the duties are carried out. The chairman should also coordinate with other relevant SNIC bodies, e.g. the SUPR-SAMS group, the SNAC Chairman, and the user-support coordination group.

3.7 SNIC National User Support

The user support coordinators assign suitable Application Experts for review taking every week. The coordinators should consider relevant competencies and merits when they assign Application Experts for review duty. Skills related to certain computer programs is one example of competencies to be considered.

3.8 Responsibilities for the SNAC Secretary

- Administer SNIC Rounds in collaboration with SNAC wg.
- Prepare and publish information about SNIC Rounds.
- Prepare timelines for the rounds of SNIC Large Compute and Storage in collaboration with the SNAC Chairman.
- Draw up minutes by SNAC meetings.
- Act as a contact person for SNAC, SNAC wg, and the SNIC Office.

The SNAC Secretary is appointed, for as long as needed, by the SNIC Director.

Neither the SNIC Director nor the SNIC Office actively participates in the review.

4 Review

SNIC uses peer review to assess the scientific quality of the applications and the potential of the research. Peer review involves well-qualified researchers within the same or nearby subject area scrutinising the applications.

4.1 Process for SNAC (scientific review)

Each SNAC member is allotted some proposals for review following the closing of the Large rounds. You typically have about three weeks to read the proposals allocated to you, write evaluations (assessment of preliminary statement), and grade and rank the proposals reviewed by you before the Allocation Meeting. The deadlines for reviews of a particular round is provided by the SNIC Office.

In addition to the SNAC member, each proposal is also given to an external reviewer, chosen by subject speciality. The SNAC member and the external reviewer each perform a scientific review. Each proposal also undergoes a technical review.

The scientific reviewer is asked to assess questions regarding the proposal using a seven-grade rating system, as defined below. The rating system and the questions with help texts are also available in SUPR.

The review work shall be carried out with great integrity. Reviewers shall not have contact with individual applicants regarding the application or the review, either during or after the review process.

The assessment shall pay attention to the requirement for ethical review of research relating to humans or animals.

4.2 Process for SNAC wg (technical review)

Three SNAC wg members form an active sub-group responsible for reviewing during a month, using a rotating scheme where one person enters while another leaves each month. July is exempt, and the work is moved earlier in December to cater for the Christmas festivities.

Owners of existing SNIC resources may choose not to participate in the common evaluation described below. Storage allocation is deemed too centre specific, and not included in national allocation at this time. Proposals including resources not allocated nationally will be handled in cooperation with the respective centre.

4.2.1 Small rounds

The active subgroup shall decide on requests for small projects at least once a week.

4.2.2 Medium rounds

Continuously someone in the active sub-group keeps an eye on incoming proposals, asking for clarification if necessary. Under the supervision of the active sub-group, an Application Expert in charge during the week reviews the proposal and fills in a spreadsheet provided by SNAC wg.

Proposals available to the reviewers by the 15th should be reviewed and decided during that month. A pre-evaluation assessment should be carried out by the active subgroup, informing the applicant if any vital information is lacking by writing a comment and reverting the proposal to editing status. If the pre-evaluation is successful, the status of the proposal should be set for immediate technical review. It is the responsibility of the group leader to arrange a review meeting. The cut-off date for any addenda or corrigenda is the 20th. Technical reviews can be written by Application Experts assigned by the active subgroup, or by SNAC wg members. Reviews are expected to be finished around the 22nd, and a decision meeting, initiated by the group leader, should be held at the latest on the last day of the month. Decisions should be sent out in time to allow for new allocations to commence on the 1st of the following month. In conjunction with major holidays, the schedule may deviate.

4.2.3 Large rounds

SNAC wg performs vetting of allocations shortly before a Large round closes, informing prospective applicants about necessary addenda or corrigenda. This process is reiterated by the SNIC Office and a select subset of experts when the round is closed.

The SNAC Chairman assigns SNAC wg personnel for technical review of SNIC Large proposals during a meeting shortly after the round is closed.

4.3 Confidentiality

Throughout the review process, all applications and the appraisal shall be treated confidentially. Reviewers should not disseminate the documents made available to them during their work as panel members and must delete them after completing the assignment. Third parties should not be informed of meeting discussions, or of the views of other reviewers in the ongoing review

process. All communications between applicants and SNAC regarding the review process or the grounds on which decisions are made should be handled via SUPR.

4.4 How to do a review in SUPR

The reviewer must have registered a SWAMID federated identity or a client certificate to use either of those methods to log into SUPR (<https://supr.snic.se/>). It is also possible to log in using an email address and the corresponding SUPR password. There is an option *Request Password* on the SUPR login page if needed. When logged in, reviewers can choose the link *Reviews* in the menu bar on the left side of the site.

4.5 Working with SUPR

To view a proposal in the SUPR portal, select the link in the *Proposal to review* column. Then you will see your review, if filled in, followed by the proposal details, including a list of documents attached to the proposal. You may also view past resource usage by the Principal Investigator. To write your proposal review in the SUPR portal, use the *Edit Review* button near the top of the page, fill in the fields, and use *Save Review* to save your answers. You can update your proposal as many times as you like until the allocation meeting. However, we kindly ask you to finish before the deadline.

When you have finished, please have a look at the *Review state* column in the review table. *Completed* means that a review has come to an end (with all required fields entered), while *Editing* and *Assigned* indicate that you have not entered all the necessary information.

💡 Use the field *Comments to PI* for comments you suggest should be sent to the PI of the proposal. The contents of this comment field from all reviews for a proposal will be merged by the Working Group after the allocation meeting and included in the decision information sent to the PI. No other information from the reviews will be sent to the PI.

💡 SNAC members must also fill in the field *suggested allocation*. This ensures there is an allocation suggestion in place before the meeting.

The aggregated capacity requested per resource is presented on the *Round page* in SUPR. If you need help with the system or the review process, please contact support@supr.snic.se.

4.6 Reading proposals and writing reviews

You shall base your review only on the application contents. Information that is irrelevant to the review must not be used. **Irrelevant information** can sometimes be difficult to distinguish from expertise in the field. Examples of irrelevant information are details of the applicant's private life or various types of rumours.

The starting point for the assessment is that the contents of an application and the information about the applicant **shall not be shared** with colleagues outside the panel. Sometimes questions arise where it is acceptable to consult with a colleague on specific parts of the proposal. This may be justified as long as the application is not shared with third parties, and the consultation is limited to specific scientific questions. It is your task as a reviewer to assess the application in its entirety.

If you suspect any **scientific misconduct** or deviation from good research practice, you must immediately contact the SNIC Office. The SNIC Office will ensure that the matter is further investigated.

5 The allocation meeting

After the review process, SUPR will open for reading, so that you as a SNAC member can prepare for the discussion at the Allocation Meeting by reading the assessments by the other reviewers. The time and place for the allocation meeting are provided by the SNIC Office.

The allocation meeting is attended by SNAC, SNAC wg, and the SNAC Secretary. The meeting is chaired by the SNAC Chairman. If the SNAC Chairman has conflicts of interest for a proposal, the meeting will then be chaired by the vice-chairman.

5.1 Sifting

To allow for more time to discuss the proposals judged to have a reasonable chance of being granted, a sifting process takes place, where the proposals judged as having no chance of being granted are screened out before the Allocation Meeting.

It is the task of the SNAC Chairman and vice-chairman, with the assistance of the SNAC Secretary, to use the reviewers' initial grading and ranking to make a list for the applications to be screened out. Proposals, where the ranking and grading differ considerably between the reviewers, are not to be screened out without clarifying discussion early on during the panel meeting.

The proposed list of applications to be screened out will be available to all SNAC members. As a SNAC member, you always have the opportunity to ask for a screened-out application to be brought up for discussion at the panel meeting.

5.2 Review of proposals handled at the allocation meeting

At the start of the meeting, SNAC members will have the opportunity to bring up proposals that have been screened out to be included among those to be discussed at the meeting. Screened-out proposals will be given grades for each criterion and a standard final statement. The separate grades will be suggested by the reviewer, based on the individual reviews, and finalised by the SNAC Board.

Each proposal reviewed is gone through and briefly discussed during the meeting. The order is decided by the overall grading of the proposals: The proposal that received the highest grade is reviewed first, and the proposal with the lowest grade is reviewed last.

Individually for each proposal, the SNAC member who has performed a review briefly presents the member's review, the review that has been done by the external reviewer, and the technical review by SNAC wg. All reviews are available on-screen during the meeting.

The SNAC Board has full responsibility for all proposals assigned to the panel. Each proposal shall be evaluated based on its own merits, and irrelevant information must not be included in the discussions. No proposal may be given a higher or lower grade because it belongs to a specific subject area. Nor shall the board carry out any quota-based allocation between the scientific sub-disciplines in the panel.

It is important that a proposal/applicant receives a new assessment each time applying, and that all proposals are assessed in the same way. Due to this reason, the SNAC Board will not have access to previous proposals or assessments.

The SNAC Board needs to remember that the meeting time is limited and that there will be many applications to discuss. Therefore, it will be important to find a balance between the

quality of assessment and the time allocated. The SNAC Chairman and SNAC Secretary will help to keep track of the time.

Following the review being presented, the allocation for the specific proposal is then presented and discussed by the reviewer, and then discussed by the committee. Following this, the allocation is typed into an allocation sheet, which will be seen on-screen during the meeting. This sheet is sent out to the whole group for proof after the meeting.

5.3 Priority

After all of the proposals have been discussed at the meeting, and once the board has agreed on the grades for all proposals, the board should also create a priority list including the applications with the highest overall grades. The review panel will conclude the priority list by suggesting which applications should be approved.

6 Criteria and grading scale

Proposals for SNIC resources are subject to technical and/or scientific review. The type of review is determined by the type of SNIC Round. The review criteria and grading scale used by SNIC is based on those used by the Swedish Research Council. The criteria and help questions are subject to review and update by the SNIC director when deemed necessary.

The sub-criteria will be weighed together into an overall grade reflecting the collected evaluation of the application's sub-grades given by the review panel. The overall grade is formulated without a pre-determined numerical algorithm based on the basic criteria. As guidance for the review panel assessment, the scientific quality of the proposed research and the merits of the applicant are the two most important criteria. Novelty and originality should also be considered in the assessment but should be given a lower weight than the quality of the project and the merits of the applicant. The feasibility shall be weighed into the overall rating of the application if it deviates from the grade *Feasible*.

For all criteria, you have also the option to mark *Insufficient*, if you consider the proposal lacks sufficient information to allow a sensible evaluation to be made of the criterion.

For storage projects, the SNIC Policy for Project Storage (SNIC 2018/39) applies.

6.1 Scientific review

Scientific review is made within the SNIC rounds **Large Compute**, **Large Storage** and **SENS Large**. The criteria and scales detailed below are used.

Each proposal is given a grade. At the Large allocation meeting, proposals are ranked according to their overall grade. Reviewers motivate the grading via the SNIC user and project repository, SUPR, and at the allocation meeting.

6.1.1 Criteria and questions to ask for each criterion

1) Scientific Quality of the Proposed Research

Questions to ask for this criterion:

- a) Is the proposed research scientifically significant?
- b) How does the proposed project relate to the state of the art in the research area?

- c) Do the scientific questions have the purpose to fill in significant knowledge gaps and is the project description sufficiently detailed and of sufficient quality to reach, or in a significant way make advances towards reaching these objectives?
- d) Does the proposed project define new, interesting scientific questions and/or new ways to address important scientific questions?
- e) When applicable, does the proposed project show a clear progression and novelty relative to the previous research conducted by the applicant?

2) Merits of the Applicant

Question to ask for this criterion:

- a) Does the applicant have adequate competence within the scientific area of the proposal?

3) Feasibility, or Implementation of the Proposed Project

Question to ask for this criterion:

- a) Does the proposed research group have the adequate scientific competence required to be able to carry out the proposed research?

Additional questions to ask for this criterion regarding Storage rounds:

- a) Does the proposed research group have the ability to carry out the data management described in the proposal?
- b) Is the need for large scale storage justified clearly in the proposal?
- c) Is the data management plan clear and well justified? Does it address open science appropriately?

4) Activity Report

Questions to ask for this criterion:

- a) What is the outcome of SNIC allocations during the last two years (i.e. publications, academic achievements and HPC/data-related development, as described in the activity report)?
- b) Do the publications listed in the activity report acknowledge the use of SNIC resources?

6.1.2 Scale for scientific review

There are two grading scales used for scientific review.

6.1.2.1 The seven-grade scale

This scale is used for assessing the Scientific Quality, Merits of the Applicant, and the overall grading of the proposal. It is defined as follows:

- 1) **Poor**
Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
- 2) **Weak**
A few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses

- 3) **Good**
Some strengths but also moderate weaknesses
- 4) **Very good**
Strong application with minor weaknesses
- 5) **Very good to excellent**
Very strong application with minor weaknesses
- 6) **Excellent**
Very strong application with negligible weaknesses
- 7) **Outstanding**
Exceptionally strong application with negligible weaknesses

6.1.2.2 The three-grade scale

This paragraph is a preparation for upcoming calls. Until further notice, the reviewers may use the seven-grade scale also for assessing Feasibility if they deem it fit to do so.

This scale is used for assessing the Feasibility of the proposal. It is defined as:

- 1) **Feasible**
- 2) **Partly feasible**
- 3) **Not feasible**

6.1.3 Other review considerations

- 1) SNAC may, if the applicant has not previously been granted a Large allocation, decide to grant a six-month Large allocation.
- 2) SNAC may take into consideration if the applicant has not acknowledged the use of SNIC resources in publications listed in the mandatory activity report requirements as detailed in the SNIC user guide (SNIC 2018/35).
- 3) SNAC may reject, or adjust, proposals for Large rounds, and recommend the applicant to submit a proposal for other SNIC Rounds, if:
 - a) Scientific and/or technical review deems the proposal suitable for another SNIC Round,
 - b) The previous usage deviates from the previous allocation decision,
 - c) If the applicant has no previous experience in using SNIC resources.¹

6.2 Technical review

Technical review is performed within the SNIC Rounds **Large Compute, Large Storage, SENS Large, Medium Compute, Medium Storage, SENS/SSC Medium, Small Compute, Small Storage, and SENS/SSC Small**. The criteria and scale detailed below are used.

¹ Experience from using similar resources in other countries may be considered.

For **Large Compute**, **Large Storage**, and **SENS Large** each proposal is given a grade. Reviewers motivate the grading via the SNIC user and project repository, SUPR, and at the allocation meeting.

Questions on a grey background are common to all criteria, blue for storage, orange for AI, fuschia for SSC, and purple for some other subset of rounds.

6.2.1 Pre-evaluation criteria

1) Possibility

Questions to ask for this criterion:

- a) Is the PI eligible, as set forth by the SNIC Guideline for Applicants and Administrators (SNIC 2018/35)?
- b) Are all required programs available on the intended resource?
- c) If commercial programs or data sets are intended to be used, are licenses and license costs catered for?
- d) Is default storage included for the intended resource? If not, has the PI sent in an accompanying storage proposal?

2) Efficiency

Questions to ask for this criterion:

- a) Is this project best placed on the proposed resource?
 - a. Does the project require processor types that are present on the intended resource?
 - b. If applicable, is scaling information provided?
 - c. Does the proposal contain a calculation or description of how the proposed core hours will be used?
- b) Is the amount of storage and I/O load required by using the programs enumerated in the proposal properly assessed?

6.2.2 Criteria and questions to ask for each criterion

1) Possibility

Questions to ask for this criterion:

- a) Is the PI eligible, as set forth by the SNIC Guideline for Applicants and Administrators (SNIC 2018/35)?
- b) Has the applicant previously used the resources listed in the proposal?

Questions to ask for this criterion regarding Compute, SENS, SSC, and AI rounds:

- a) Does the applicant have the ability to carry out the calculations described in the proposal?
- b) Is it viable to use the proposed software on the resources listed in the proposal?
- c) In particular, do the resources enumerated in the proposal have licenses for the programs and data sets requested in the proposal (e.g. being provided by the PI)?
- d) Is default storage included for the intended resource? If so, does it match the amount of data foreseen by the project according to the data management plan? If not, has the PI sent in an accompanying storage proposal?

! At the SNIC homepage, there are links to all SNIC resources where currently available programs and data sets, where applicable, are enumerated.

Additional questions to ask for this criterion regarding AI rounds:

- a) Is the project proposed primarily using AI techniques, e.g. machine learning?
- b) Is a list of data sets to be used, if any, a description of how data will be used in the project and a plan to move data from the resource after the project is provided?
- c) Does the applicant have the ability to manage the data described in the proposal on the resource?
- d) Does the applicant have the ability to transfer the data described in the proposal from the resource?

Questions to ask for this criterion regarding Storage rounds:

- e) Does the applicant have the ability to transfer the data described in the proposal to the resource?
- f) Does the applicant have the ability to manage the data described in the proposal on the resource?
- g) Does the applicant have the ability to transfer the data described in the proposal from the resource?
- h) Has the applicant previously used the resources listed in the proposal?
- i) Does the resources listed in the proposal have the space requested in the proposal available?
- j) Is the suggested workflow feasible? Is the data management plan clear and well justified? Does it address open science appropriately?

Question to ask for this criterion regarding SSC rounds:

- a) If the application includes some kind of web service or portal, will access be limited to the project members?

2) Efficiency

Questions to ask for this criterion regarding Compute, SENS, SSC, and AI rounds:

- a) Is the planned use of the resources, as described in the proposal, efficient use of the resources?
 - i) Does the project require processor types that are present on the intended resources?
 - ii) If applicable, is scaling information provided?
 - iii) Does the proposal contain a calculation or description of how the proposed core hours will be used?
- b) Does the proposal describe the planned usage of the resources in line with the best practice of the application area?

Questions to ask for this criterion regarding Storage rounds:


- a) Is the planned use of the resources, as described in the proposal, efficient use of the resources? This includes an adequate workflow to balance the use of high-performance and low-cost storage.
- b) Is it viable to store/process the dataset in the way described in the proposal, on the resources listed in the proposal?
- c) Does the proposal describe the planned usage of the resources in line with the best practice of the application area?

Question to ask for this criterion regarding SSC rounds:

- a) Is the project suitable for SSC? If it is possible, without being cumbersome, to use a traditional HPC resource it should be given precedence.

3) Track record

Question to ask for this criterion:

- a) Has the applicant used previous SNIC allocations as granted?
Note: The technical evaluation shall take into account explanations offered by the applicant regarding previous usage deviating from what was planned.
- b) Does the PI have other active projects?
 The SNIC Guideline for Applicants and Administrators define the limits for Medium projects using multiple SNIC resources and how a single PI may simultaneously be assigned Medium and Large projects.

Questions to ask for continuation projects:

- a) Has the proposal been updated from previous proposals?
- b) Was the resource utilisation high ($\geq 70\%$)?
- c) Were the core hours used evenly or has the project proceeded in a bursting manner?
- d) Does the former project have an activity report?
- e) Does papers correctly acknowledge SNIC?
 - a. How many papers have been produced, and are they published in high-impact magazines?

6.2.3 Scale for Technical Review

SNIC uses the same scale as the Swedish Research Council. However, the SNAC working group (SNAC wg) has decided to use a five-grade subset of the scale for technical reviews defined as follows:

- 1) **Poor**
Motivation for resource need, scaling, and software usage is described with severe weaknesses.
- 2) **Weak**
Motivation for resource need, scaling, and software usage is described with major weaknesses.

3) Good

Motivation for resource need, scaling, and software usage is described with moderate weaknesses.

4) Very good

Motivation for resource need, scaling, and software usage is adequately described, but with minor weaknesses.

5) Very good to excellent

Motivation for resource need, scaling, and software usage is adequately described.

6.2.4 Other review considerations

- 1) SNAC wg may reject, or adjust, allocations listed in proposals.
- 2) If an applicant has not previously received a SNAC Medium allocation, SNAC wg may decide to grant a limited allocation in terms of resources and timespan.
- 3) Except for SENS projects, will the project proposed only be using non-sensitive data?
- 4) Does the applicant have the necessary academic qualification for the round in question?
- 5) An applicant is not allowed to simultaneously be allocated SNIC resources within the SNIC Rounds SNIC Medium Compute and SNIC Large Compute, or SNIC Medium Storage and SNIC Large Storage.

💡 *A combination of Medium Compute and Large Storage, or vice versa, is fine.*
- 6) Storage projects that are split up into several projects only to avoid a more thorough review should, after assessment, be denied.
- 7) Swestore is not intended for backups or as an archiving service for long-term storage, and such requests for allocation should be rejected.
- 8) The total size of all MEDIUM allocations granted to you can maximally amount to 150%.

7 Decision

The decision regarding the application should be communicated with the PI and documented in SUPR.

- Compute capacity should be expressed in terms of kch/month.
- Storage capacity should be expressed in terms of size (GiB), the number of files, and time (months).
- SSC capacity should be expressed in terms of coins.

For storage rounds, SNAC may prematurely terminate, extend, or change the allocation within the limits of the round. For Small and Medium rounds this is administrated by the SNAC wg. Such decisions shall be communicated with the PI and documented in SUPR.

Decisions by SNAC are final and cannot be appealed, e.g. to the SNIC Director.