

Name
Address

21 December 2015

Scientific Project Officer:
e-mail:
Administrative Project Officer:
e-mail:

Applicant:
Project number:
Project title:
Reviewer:

Dear [Mr/Ms ...](#),

On behalf of the Executive Board of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), I would like to thank you for your willingness to prepare a review of this application. The FWF will ensure that your identity is not revealed. At the same time, we would ask you not to inform anyone about the application or your review activities.

In providing your written review, please use the FWF review form to enter your responses electronically in the spaces provided below each set of questions, and please fill out the formal review section.

Please note that Section 1 of your written review will be transmitted in its entirety to the applicant (without including your name); Section 2 will not be sent to the applicant and will thus remain completely confidential.

If possible, please e-mail the review form to the FWF at the e-mail address indicated above. If you are unable to send us your review by e-mail, it can also be sent by fax or conventional mail.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest (confidential)

You should refrain from reviewing the application if a conflict of interest exists or could be perceived to exist. A conflict of interest is considered to arise if you stand to profit professionally, financially or personally from the approval or rejection of the application. You should also refrain from providing a review if you have published with, cooperated with or worked at the same research institution as the applicant or any of the project employees in the past five years; if you have fundamental differences of scientific/scholarly opinion with them, or if you have close links, either professional or private, to the applicant or any of the co-workers. In such cases, we would ask you to inform the FWF's Secretariat.

Your declaration will be handled in strict confidence by the FWF's Secretariat and will not be passed on to other persons under any circumstances. There is no need to mention normal scientific/scholarly contact, for example at conferences or workshops.

If you do not make such a declaration, we will assume that no conflicts of interest exist.

Thank you in advance for your contribution to the promotion of scholarly research in Austria / Italy.

Yours sincerely,

Department for

Information for FWF Referees¹

EGTC - Interregional Project Networks (IPN)

In the framework of its agency function the FWF supports partner organisation with expertise in science and evaluation. As a service provider the FWF also offers know how and instruments for organisations providing money to support non-profit scientific research.

The Euregio Science Fund (EGTC) www.europaregion.info/research, as one of these partners, provides financial support for interregional basic research projects which fulfil international criteria with respect to scientific quality standards.

These proposed "Interregional Project Networks (IPN)" shall foster and strengthen networks between scientists and researchers as well as existing research centres within the European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino and, at best, be the basis for joint project proposals for EU research programmes.

The EGTC Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino delegated the external scientific review of project proposals submitted to the FWF. Funding decisions about the submitted projects will be taken by the EGTC.

EGTC - IPN Programme Description

Target Group

Interregional project networks are research projects in the field of basic research in which scientists and researchers from preferable all three regions Tyrol, South Tyrol and Trentino co-operate in pursuing a common research goal corresponding to the goals of the EGTC. It is only advisable to apply for such a project if the preferable three parts of the project **are closely integrated** so that one part could not be carried out without the others.

Purpose

- Development of new ideas in various scientific areas of non-profit scientific research
- Creating research networks between the 3 regions Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino
- Funding interregional research networks that involve preferable all 3 regions Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino, present an overarching common goal and discuss a collaborative approach
- Fostering interregional research networks in the main thematic fields of interregional cooperation
- Support of project networks with a project volume of 250.000 Euro up to 500.000 Euro and a funding period of 24 up to 36 months
- Increasing international visibility of scientists and researchers from the European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino
- Giving to give young scientists and researchers an opportunity to improve their knowledge, professional skills and integration into the scientific community

Requirements

For Tyrol: Any scientist or researcher working in the European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino who possesses the capacity, the infrastructure necessary to carry out the submitted project in Tyrol or based at an Tyrolean research institution as well as the qualifications listed below.

For South Tyrol and Trentino: Applications for project parts regarding South Tyrol and Trentino may only be submitted by research organisations such as university or research institute, irrespective of its legal status (organised under public or private law) or way of financing. The Research Organisation

¹ Further information about the FWF's Corporate Policy and a copy of the Application Guidelines for Interregional Network Projects (IPN) can be found on the FWF's website (<http://www.fwf.ac.at/en/about-the-fwf/corporate-policy/>) and the EGTC website <http://www.europaregion.info/en/euregio-science-fund.asp>.

has to name a scientist or researcher who will lead the project and possesses the following qualifications:

Scientific/Scholarly Demands on the Leaders of the Project Parts

The following criteria are decisive in the assessment of the scientist or researcher's research qualifications and determine whether a review procedure is initiated:

- **Number of publications:** The applicant's number of publications should correspond to his/her career to date; however, each applicant must have at least two publications in the five years prior to submission of the application.
- **Independence:** The applicant's independent contribution to the publication should be visible. For example, at least one publication listing the applicant as the first author is required in the Life Sciences category.
- **Peer review:** The publications must have been subjected to a quality assurance procedure in line with high international standards, meaning that the journals must be listed in the Web of Science, Scopus or the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). In the case of monographs, anthologies or other publication types, the peer-review procedure must be documented on the publisher's website.
- **International publications:** In the natural sciences, life sciences and social sciences, the majority of the applicant's publications must be in English; in the humanities, the majority of publications should go beyond German-and Italian speaking countries and be published outside of Austria and Italy; any exceptions must be justified.

The partners should nominate an IPN coordinator who then overtakes several tasks in the course of the administration of the funded projects.

Length - A minimum of 24 up to a maximum of 36 months

Level - A total of 250.000 up to 500.000 Euro

Application - All parts of the applications must be submitted in English

Allocation

Funding decisions are made by the Board of the EGTC European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino based on the funding recommendation taken by the FWF Board and the Scientific Advisory Board of the EGTC European Region Tyrol-South Tyrol-Trentino; the EGTC basis its funding decision on 2-3 international written reviews. The EGTC will take the decision between October and November 2016.

Call Budget

1.400.000 Euro – based on the size of the projects 2-4 projects will be funded most likely

Time Frame

The call will be open between the 22nd of December 2014 and the 29th of February 2015 / 6 pm CET.

Details on the formal assessment (ratings)

<p>Excellent = funding with highest priority The proposed research project is among the best 5% in the field worldwide. It is potentially groundbreaking and/or makes a major contribution to knowledge. The applicant and the researchers involved possess – relative to their academic age – exceptional qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p>Very Good = funding with high priority The proposed research project is among the best 15% in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally, but minor improvements could be made. The applicant and the researchers involved possess – relative to their academic age – high qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p>Good = resubmission with some revisions The proposed research project is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses, and/or the applicant and the researchers involved possess – relative to their academic age – good qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p>Average = resubmission with major revisions The proposed research project will provide some new insights but has significant weaknesses and/or the applicant and the researchers involved possess – relative to their academic age – fair qualifications by international standards.</p>
<p>Poor = rejection The proposed research project is weak and/or the applicant and the researchers involved lack sufficient qualifications by international standards.</p>

Applicant:
Project number:
Reviewer:

Evaluation Forms for the submitted IPN

Part 1 – Written Evaluation²

In all of its programmes, the FWF actively supports equal opportunities and equal treatment. The review of an application must not put the applicant at a disadvantage for non-scientific/non-scholarly reasons such as age, gender, etc. For example, the assessment of research proposals should not be based on the applicants' actual age, but instead on the individual circumstances relating to the duration of their scientific/scholarly careers and previous research achievements. The FWF endeavours to ensure equal opportunities for all applicants and thus takes into consideration if delays in the scientific/scholarly careers of applicants such as gaps in publication activity or less time spent abroad have been unavoidable (e.g. due to longer qualification periods, time spent raising children, long-term illness etc.). When preparing your review, please keep in mind that your comments in Section I will be forwarded in their entirety to the applicant (without including your name).

It is the EGTC / FWF's duty to ensure the best possible use of public-sector funds in the field of basic research. On the basis of the project application requirements defined by the EGTC,³ reviewers should be able to provide brief comments on the aspects indicated below for each application.

Section 1 (to be transmitted anonymously to the applicant in its entirety)

Please provide a written review and formal assessment (rating) of the questions in Section 1. Please double-click the desired rating field in order to activate the check box for the desired assessment.

In all cases, decisions are based on the **written reviews** from referees and not solely on the **ratings** they assign.

1.) Scientific/scholarly quality (including innovative aspects and originality) with special attention to strengths and weaknesses:

<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> very good	<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> poor
------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

Applicant:

² Further information about the **FWF's** Corporate Policy and a copy of the Application Guidelines for Interregional Network Projects (IPN) can be found on the FWF's website (<http://www.fwf.ac.at/en/about-the-fwf/corporate-policy/>) and the **EGTC** website <http://www.europaregion.info/en/euregio-science-fund.asp>.

³ **Formal requirements:** A project description no more than 20 pages in length (including tables or figures), a list of literature relevant to the project and a list of abbreviations (no more than five pages); scientific curricula vitae of known project participants (no more than three pages); (project-related) publication lists of project participants (limited to publications from the past five years).

Project number:
Reviewer:

2.) Approach/methods and feasibility of the proposal with special attention to strength and weaknesses (Note: a special focus should be put on the collaborative approach, the integration and complementarity of the scientific contributions of the different project partners)

<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> very good	<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> poor
------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

3.) Qualifications of the researchers involved (based on their academic age) with special attention to strengths and weaknesses:

<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> very good	<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> poor
------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

Applicant:
Project number:
Reviewer:

4. Overall evaluation with regard to key strengths and weaknesses:

<input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> very good	<input type="checkbox"/> good	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> poor
------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

5. Ethical issues:

Does the project give rise to any ethical issues? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> do not know
IF YES: Have they been sufficiently addressed or do they need to be addressed more specifically?
Comments:

5. Overall evaluation with regard to key strengths and weaknesses and final funding recommendation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent - funding with highest priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good - funding with high priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Good - resubmission with some revisions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Average - resubmission with major revisions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor - rejection

Please note that both the EGTC and the FWF place high demands on the quality of the projects it funds and thus predominantly supports projects rated as “very good” or “excellent”.

Applicant:
Project number:
Reviewer:

Section 2 (confidential remarks to the FWF)

1.) Any other comments to the FWF:

2.) Optional: Brief reviewer profile (background information for FWF Reporters)

The information requested below will help the FWF to maintain the quality of its peer-review procedure and help ensure that a balanced variety of members of the international scientific community are involved in this procedure. The FWF will process these data electronically and use them for statistical purposes in anonymous and aggregate form only.

Age group: <40 40-50 50-60 >60

Sex: female male

Current academic position:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> PhD | <input type="checkbox"/> MD |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Full Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Researcher |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: ... | |

Additional information: