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1. General information

- **Mission**
  - Funding of *fundamental & strategic* research
  - Funding programmes
    - Individual researchers (pre-, post-doc, mobility)
    - Research teams (projects, SBO, brain gain Odysseus,...)
    - Research infrastructure
    - Scientific prizes

- **Principles**
  - **Bottom-up** in all disciplines
  - **Scientific excellence** and interuniversity (incl. research institutes) competition
  - Transparent and **equal opportunities**
1. General information

Budget 2021: **480 MEUR** (incl. EOS and Odysseus)

- **2021** 266 new projects: 89 Jr – 177 Sr
  - € 120,4 Mio
- **2021** 1,386 running projects
  - 1,926 scientific staff
  - 289 technical staff

32% Projects FR 68% Call 2021
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1. General information

RESEARCH INTEGRITY

• Part of FWO Policy
• Clause in call text, application and contract on commitment to RI
• Profiles for (co)promoters and researchers
• Articles in General Regulation on procedure and sanctions in case of RI violation

• Read the detailed information and the RI Clause!

*Every applicant and beneficiary is expected to know the rules and what (s)he will be committed to.*
1. General information

Open Access

• Why?
  • Publicly funded research should also be publicly available.

• What?
  • Publications resulting (partly) from FWO funding → Focus: articles
  • Also applies to already ongoing fellowships/projects/grants

• How?
  • Published in an OA database ("green" OA) → Minimum requirement
  • Full ("gold") or partly ("hybrid") OA journals → Bench fees

• When?
  • Green OA selected? Maximum embargo period of 12 months
  • Right implemented in Belgian federal law (Art. XI.196, §2/1 of the Economic Law Code)

• Further reading?
  FWO General Regulations, article 2, paragraph 2: https://www.fwo.be/en/general-regulations/
  Scientific integrity: https://thinkchecksubmit.org/
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General information

‘SECOND AXIS’

• Broadening our view on diverse research(ers) profiles

• Narrative, more than only ‘classic’ output and extensive definition of ‘impact’


• In application, evaluation and communication
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2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

- **Target group**
  - Professors (co-supervisor) and postdocs (co-supervisor) at universities/research institutes

- **Junior/senior: parallel calls**

- **4-year projects (min. 2 y.) – start January 1, 2023**
  - fundamental research
    - Other projects: SBO, TBM, Odysseus, thematic, ...

- **Key dates**

![Timeline Diagram](image-url)
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Junior and Senior

- Junior and Senior projects are evaluated as separate categories by the same expert panel
- Junior and Senior projects have the same success rate
- Same budget restrictions for Junior and Senior projects
- Submission and evaluation of Junior and Senior follow the same timing and procedure
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Eligibility window

PhD: before March 31 2010  March 31 2010  Apr 1 2022

senior

junior

Jan 1, 2023  start

Rule applies to ALL applicants!

Extensions eligibility window: regulations, art. 10, §5:

→ maternity-, parental-, sickness leave, mandatory military or civic service > 3m
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Eligible host institutions

• **Main host institution (affiliation) – PI/co-PI**
  • 5 Flemish universities
  • Evangelic Protestant Faculty Leuven / Faculty for Protestant Theology in Brussels
  • Maritime Academy
  • Vlerick Business School, Antwerp Management school,
  • Institute for Tropical Medicine

• **+ Flemish/federal research institutes – co-PI**
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

• 3 types of applicant (‘roles’)

1. **supervisor-spokesperson**: the main applicant of the project, affiliated to a Flemish main host institution → mandatory for each project and entire duration

2. **supervisor**: the main applicant of a partner Flemish main host institution within the project → extra main host institution is optional, but only 1 supervisor per partner main host institution and entire duration
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

• 3 types of applicant (‘roles’)

3. co-supervisor:
  • the co-applicant within the same main host institution as a supervisor(-spokesperson) already mentioned → optional
  • the main co-applicant within an eligible non-main host institution within the project (engaged for entire duration)
    → non-main host institution is optional
  • the co-applicant within the same eligible non-main host institution → optional
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

• Example for the 3 types of applicant (‘roles’)

Professor A from university X applies together with colleague B from the same university, professor C from university Y and doctor D from institution Z.

• Supervisor-spokesperson: Prof. A
• Supervisor: Prof. C
• Co-supervisors: Prof. B and Dr. D
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

• **Supervisor(-spokesperson)**
  • ZAP or equivalent appointment with PhD of minimum 50 percent at a **main host institution**
  • research director of FWO
  • ERC grantee at a **main host institution**
  • Odysseus II grantee with a **Flemish university** as main host institution.
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

- **Supervisor(-spokesperson)**
  - OR ZAP of min. 10 percent at a **main host institution** combined with
    - research fellowship FWO
    - or appointed at
      - main host institution
      - Flemish academic hospital
      - Flemish hospital with an academic character
      - recognised Flemish or federal research institution
      - Strategic Research Centre (SOC)
      - academic programme of Flemish School of Arts

- **Total employment percentage min. 70%**
  (=10% ZAP + 60% other option above)
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

- **Supervisor(-spokesperson)**
  - OR ZAP of min. 5% combined with appointment at a Flemish Academic Hospital as
    - clinical head
    - assistant clinical head
    - equivalent function
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Who can apply?

• **Co-supervisor**
  • researcher of at least postdoctoral level
    → Incl. researchers supervisor-level
  • remunerated appointment at one of the following institutions:
    • main host institution
    • academic programme of a Flemish School of Arts
    • recognised Flemish research institute
    • recognised federal scientific institute (Dutch-speaking staff)
    • non-Flemish institute → 10% of total budget
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

How many applications can you submit?

- Per supervisor-spokesperson, supervisor or co-supervisor (also without budget): maximum 2

- **Total of requested and ongoing fundamental research projects** by a supervisor-spokesperson, supervisor or co-supervisor: maximum 2 (excl. EU, bilateral a.o.)

  - **Reference date**: the date on which a newly awarded research project fundamental research would normally start (1/1/23)
  - Projects started **before Jan. 1 2019** are not taken into account
  - Ongoing and requested projects **without funding** not included
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Applications VIB

- Per expert panel: max. 50% budget can be allocated to projects with applicants affiliated to Flemish Institute for Biotechnology (VIB)
  - Exempted from that limit: projects with applicants affiliated to VIB combined with (co)promoters without VIB-affiliation
  - Remember to add all affiliations in the ‘Personalia’ section of your E-Portal
**NEW:** Retired professors (Emeriti)

- **From 2022 on,** members of the ZAP staff of a Flemish university retiring in the year of the submission of the project application or during the project period
  - Can submit two applications
  - From the moment of retirement on they have to be replaced as promotor(-spokesperson) by
    - A member of the ZAP staff
    - Who as a copromotor at the same main host institution co-submitted the project application
    - **Explain in e-form!**
  - From that moment on emeritus participates in the project as ‘emeritus mandated by the university’
    - Also on a non salaried basis possible
- **Goal:** transmission of expertise to new generation of professors
- **Comes with 5 Mio € extra** for this entire projects programme
2. Projects fundamental research at a glance

Eligible budget

- **Duration**
  - In principle 4 years, minimum 2 years
  - Also as continuation of previous project (no separate programme)

- **Staff and consumables:**
  - €45,000 - €130,000 / year / per host institution
  - Lower limit partner: €0 or 20,000 / year

- **Equipment:**
  - max. €150,000 for entire project
  - Max. 10% of the total budget for non-Flemish research institutions

→ agreement between supervisor-sp – non-Flemish co-supervisor
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3. Evaluation & selection process
Single submission and 2-step evaluation & selection process

Step 1
Remote assessment:
2 ext reviewers + 2 panel members
+ rebuttal by applicants (only for correction/clarification)
→ synthesis by panel rapporteur

Step 2
Panel meeting
consensus scoring & ranking

Selected proposals
Rejected proposals

 Infosession RP FR 2022
3. Evaluation & selection process
Submission to panels

- Each panel
  - 12 members incl. international scientific chair
  - >50% members with non-Flemish affiliation

- Panel structure
  - 30 panels in 5 scientific domains
  - 1 interdisciplinary panel (cross-domain)

- Choose panel that best fits your application! Choice is responsibility of applicant(s) only!

- Evaluation of your proposal:
  - Consensus panel decisions (scoring & ranking) in both steps
  - Roles:
    - 2 panel members as internal evaluators
    - 2 external reviewers (on-topic specialists)
      - Selected by FWO
      - You can suggest (up to 3) experts to be excluded
    - Rapporteur (synthesis & feedback)
3. Evaluation & selection process

Evaluation criteria

- **Research team** 25% weight
  - Scientific capacity, track record and collaboration

- **Project** 75% weight
  - Scientific quality, relevance & originality
  - Quality of the research approach & feasibility

- **Budget**: no criterium, but advise by panel to board of trustees
2. Projects fundamental research Evaluation & Selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final scores: panel consensus

Weighted Total Score (WTS) -> ranking

3.6 ranking
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Rebuttal

• **8 – 19 September 2022**: 2 internal + 2 external reports sent to applicants for reaction
  - Only comments, no scores
  - Supervisor-spokesperson will receive email invitation for rebuttal on **September 8 2022** at email address(es) provided in e-portal; if you do not receive this email (check spam), contact us!
• Not mandatory, but your opportunity to clarify elements
• Max. 3 pages (no other document can be uploaded)
• **Only for clarification, correction of concrete comments in the reports**
• No new elements, defence, design, ... of the proposal
• Be constructive and mind your wording
• Do not forget to effectively **submit**!
3. Evaluation & selection process

**Decision and feedback**

- Decision by board of trustees (7 December 2022)
- Results on [www.fwo.be](http://www.fwo.be)
  - Notification to all
- Contracts
  - Start January 1, 2023
- Feedback to all candidates
  - Experts comments and scores on 2 criteria
3. Evaluation & selection process

Feedback

All feedback AFTER selection decision Board consensus scores of the panel

Research team

- Synthesis by rapporteur, based on
  - Internal en external reports
  - Rebuttal
  - Panel discussion

Project

- Synthesis by rapporteur, based on
  - Internal en external reports
  - Rebuttal
  - Panel discussion

WTS

3,5

3,6

4
3. Evaluation & selection process
Timeline evaluation and selection

Submission
1 Apr 2022

Ext/Int peer review
Apr-Aug 2022

Eligibility
Apr 2022

Rebuttal
Sept 2022

Selection and granting
Nov-Dec 2022

Feedback
Jan 2023

Start contract
1 Jan 2023
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4. Preparing your application

How?

• E-Portal (www.fwo.be) *(register at least 24 hours in advance)*
4. Preparing your application
E-portal – application form

**General**
- Gender
- Place of birth
- Nationality
- **ORCID iD** *(Open Researcher and Contributor ID)* - [https://orcid.org/](https://orcid.org/)

**Addresses**
- Legal domicile address (in Belgium or abroad)
  - *Non-Belgian domicile in EU: add TIN code* (tax identification number)
  - (Future) ‘Belgian’ service address

*no access to new application before these 7 items are completed…*
4. Preparing your application

E-portal – application form

Choose junior or senior!

admin eligibility positioning
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4. Preparing your application

E-portal – application form

Evaluation ‘team’

Evaluation ‘project’
4. Preparing your application

E-portal – application form

Evaluation criterium ‘team’

- Scientific capacity, track record and collaboration of
  - Supervisor(s)
  - Co-supervisor(s)

Also (in CV under tab Host institutions & Supervisors) – new ‘2nd axis’:

- **Research Statement**: a narrative on your scientific career in past, present and future
- **Short CV**: broad spectrum of activities
- **Career Path**: to specify your profile
- **Career Breaks**
- **5 main publications and/or achievements**
- Other scientific output and impact
- **List obtained funding 5 years**
- Scientific awards
4. Preparing your application
E-portal – application form

Tab ‘Project’: Project description

**WORD template** – max. 10 p.
- Rationale and positioning within state-of-the-art
- Scientific research objective(s)
- Research methodology and work plan
- References
- Re-submission? Changes with previous version? – Continuation of previous project?

*Other important issues*
- Submitted for other funding?
- Science communication
- Fit within the research group(s)
- (Inter)national context
- Collaboration/coordination/role/complementarity research groups

*Evaluation criterion ‘project’ step 1*
- Scientific quality, relevance & originality
- Quality of the research approach & feasibility
4. Preparing your application

E-portal – application form

Tab ‘Project’: ‘Project positioning and embedding’

2 new questions on Responsible Research & Innovation (RRI)

• Did you take the issues of gender and diversity into account while designing your research plan?
• Did you or will you work with societal actors other than research partners in the whole or parts of the research process (from design of the application up to the execution of the research)?

Evaluation criterium ‘project’ step 1

• Scientific quality, relevance & originality
• Quality of the research approach & feasibility
4. Preparing your application

• ETHICS

• Tab ETHICS applicable to all domains

• For info&support:
  • Research Foundation - Flanders - Research ethics (fwo.be)

• NEW – non-human primates: ethical approval procedure started before submission on April 1st!
  • Approval received when rebuttal phase starts
4. Preparing your application
Don’t forget... to SUBMIT!

Projects are submitted by the host institution!
Hence internal deadlines may apply!

→ automatic confirmation follows
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To read: info and regulations

- **Overview projects fundamental research programme**
- **General regulations**
- **Regulations on projects fundamental research**
- **Internal & external peer review**
Who to contact

- olivier.boehme@fwo.be
- an.goris@fwo.be
- tanja.rubbrecht@fwo.be
- FWOhelpdesk@fwo.be (e-portal/IT related issues)
Good luck!
Join the FWO-Community
More information about the FWO

www.fwo.be
Information about FWO’s operation, regulations, scientific prizes and appeals...
All publications are free to download

www.geschiedenisfwo.be
Module about FWO’s history

Join us
Thank you for your attention
FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH PROJECT: scoring descriptors “Research group”

1 Scientific capacity, track record and collaboration of the research group

This criterion assesses to what extent the applicants have the necessary competences and infrastructure to implement the proposed research project. This criterion also assesses to what extent the individual applicants, taking into account their scientific seniority, have made important contributions to the state-of-the-art in their respective domain as evidenced by a range of scientifically relevant activities and achievements, such as the quality and impact (rather than the quantity) of the publication record, as well as other meaningful scientific output and achievements. The latter may include education activities, supervision of pre- and postdoctoral researchers, institutional responsibilities (governance, administration, ...), membership of scientific organisations, societies, networks, R&D services provided to third parties, sabbaticals, relevant training, scientific awards and other relevant information. Consider a variety of scientific or other (societal, economic, ...) impact beyond publications and obtained research funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>&gt;40%</td>
<td>&gt;40%</td>
<td>&gt;9%</td>
<td>&gt;9%</td>
<td>&gt;9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;14%</td>
<td>&gt;14%</td>
<td>&gt;14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>&gt;60%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;90%</td>
<td>&lt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
<td>&gt;70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt;100%</td>
<td>&lt;100%</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. scientific capacity, track record and collaboration (supervisor-spokesperson, (co-)supervisor(s), and research team(s))

**Essential research expertise, knowhow or infrastructure is lacking to carry out this project.**

- **The research record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers is, taking into account their scientific seniority, less present, or less competitive.**
- **The research output and research profile, taking into account a variety of skills, activities and achievements, of the (co)PI’s as presented in the application is less convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project.**

**The complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.**

**The track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers is, taking into account their scientific seniority, less present, or less competitive.**

**The research output and research profile, taking into account a variety of skills, activities and achievements, of the (co)PI’s as presented in the application is adequate to execute the proposed project.**

**There are some doubts on whether the available competence is sufficiently fitted to an optimal execution of the project.**

**And (if applicable) the complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.**

**The proposing PI’s and research group have a good scientific track record.**

**And/or the research output and research profile, taking into account a variety of skills, activities and achievements, of the (co)PI’s as presented in the application is convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project.**

**And (if applicable) the complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.**

**The scientific track record and research achievements of all included PI’s and research teams is excellent and internationally recognized, and fully suited to execute the proposed project.**

**And/or the research output and research profile, taking into account a variety of skills, activities and achievements, of the (co)PI’s as presented in the application is convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project on a high level.**

**And (if applicable) the complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.**

**The consortium is not optimally composed: some expertise is either lacking or overlapping.**

**PI’s and involved research teams in general give evidence of a proper scientific track record and research achievements (considering PI’s scientific seniority). The available research expertise is fit to the project.**

**And/or the research output and research profile, taking into account a variety of skills, activities and achievements, of the (co)PI’s as presented in the application is convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project on a proper level.**

**And (if applicable) PI’s and involved research teams evidence a growing scientific reputation. This project seamlessly fits in this progress.**

**Complementary expertise and proper collaboration between research groups**

**There is pronounced synergy between consortium partners,**
2. Fundamental research project: scoring descriptors “Project”

### 2.a. Scientific quality, relevance of the research project & originality

An FWO research project must have an important contribution to the current international state-of-the-art. To what extent is the proposal original and will it generate knowledge that goes beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g., novel theories, innovative concepts or approaches, new methods, ...)?

### 2.b. Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project

To what extent is the proposed research approach appropriate to achieve the goals laid down in the research project? To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible, bearing in mind the project duration of four years? Feasibility also includes an assessment whether adequate staffing (profile (PhD, postdoc, technicians) and a good estimation of the workload and required consumables/equipment) are requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.a. Scientific quality, relevance of the research project & originality

- The proposal contains structural flaws and/or does not offer scientific added value to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research. and/or The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges.
- The added value of the proposal w.r.t. the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research is limited. The project is rather a catching-up effort. and/or Rather limited level of scientific risks and pronounced challenges.
- The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research is still reasonable but less pronounced or less well elaborated. and/or Not all parts of the proposal fit well with the requirements of high-risk, challenging and inventive fundamental research.
- The scientific goals of the proposal offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research activities. The project builds upon the international state-of-the-art in a sound manner. and The proposal as a whole fits well with the requirements of high-risk, challenging and inventive fundamental research.
- The project is highly original and very unique. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research and has large impact potential (‘groundbreaking’ research). The proposal demonstrates a very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies.

#### 2.b. Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project

- Evident discrepancy/mismatch between research goals and research approach. and/or The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach.
- The research approach shows serious flaws or shortcomings. The research approach must be improved substantially. and/or The match between research goals and approach needs to be adjusted considerably. and (if applicable) The work distribution is not well balanced taking into account the expertise of the partners. The roles of each partner are not well defined.
- The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings. and/or leaves room for improvement. and/or The balance between scientific challenge and feasibility of the scientific project objectives is reasonable. and/or Some gaps or shortcomings in project planning and management. Resources may need to be reviewed. and (if applicable) The balance in work distribution is reasonably in line with the expertise. Reasonably well defined roles of each partner.
- The proposed methodology is well elaborated, relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. No significant gaps or shortcomings. and The project implementation is realistic and feasible within the four-year time frame. Timescales and resources are properly justified. and (if applicable) Good balance in work distribution taking into account the expertise of each partner. Well defined role of each partner.
- Requirements ‘(very) good’, and thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options, and (if applicable) The research plan is focused on high level of integration, cross-fertilization and synergy between the partners. The role of each partner is clearly defined.