Opening new horizons
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Project fundamental research
2023
This presentation:

- Applicant’s “quick starting guide”
  - Supporting documents on programme webpage

- DISCLAIMER
  - Only key points discussed
  - Official & binding documents: regulations in Dutch
    - English regulations: no legal status
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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 2022: **480 MEUR** (incl. EOS and Odysseus)

- **2022** 276 new projects: 83 Jr – 193 Sr
- **2022** 1.385 running projects
- • € 130 Mio
- • 1.988 scientific staff
- • 311 technical staff

- **31%** Projects FR (P-SP Call 2021)
- **69%** Call 2022
- **23,2%** Project FR
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1. General information

RESEARCH INTEGRITY

• Part of FWO Policy
• Clause in call text, application and contract on committment 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 they 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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1. General information

‘SECOND AXIS’

• Broadening our view on diverse research(ers) profiles
  • Narrative, more than only ‘classic’ output and extensive definition of ‘impact’
  • CV with a broad set of activities
  • 5 main publications and/or achievements

• Integrated in application, evaluation and communication
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2. Projects fundamental research

- **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, 2024**
  - fundamental research
    - Other projects: [SBO, TBM, Odysseus, thematic, ...](#)

- **Key dates**
2. Projects fundamental research

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

Eligibility window

PhD: before March 31 2011 March 31 2011 Apr 1 2023

senior

junior

Jan 1, 2024

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
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 (1/1/24)
  - Ongoing and requested projects **without funding** not included
2. Projects fundamental research

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
2. Projects fundamental research
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

Eligible budget

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

- **Staff and consumables:**
  - **Entire project:** min. €50.000/year
  - **Per institution:** max. 145.000/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
2. Projects fundamental research

Eligible budget

• Adequate budget for infrastructure
  • Distinction between *purchase* and *use* of infrastructure
  • *E.g.* VIB: also accessible for non-VIB researchers, but use comes with a cost
    → Calculate and add to budget in proposal!
• *Use* of infrastructure under categorie ‘Staff&Consumables’
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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
3. Evaluation & selection process
Submission to panels

- Each panel
  - 12 - 14 members incl. international scientific chair
  - >50% members with non-Flemish affiliation

- Panel structure
  - 31 panels in 5 scientific domains
  - 1 specific interdisciplinary panel: crossing and within domains

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

- 2023: panel structure reform!
Panel structure fundamental research has been reformed

- **Biological Sciences**
  - Bio1: Molecular and Cellular Biology
  - Bio2: Functional Biology
  - Bio3: Biodiversity, Ecology and Evolution
  - Bio4: Applied Biological Sciences

- **Humanities**
  - Cult1: Linguistics
  - Cult2: Art, Art History, Architecture, Design and Literature
  - Cult3: History and Archaeology
  - Cult4: Theology and Religious Studies
  - Cult5: Philosophy and Ethics

- **Social Sciences**
  - G&M1: Sciences of Law and Criminology
  - G&M2: Economics, Business Administration and Management
  - G&M3: Psychology, Pedagogy and Educational Sciences
  - G&M4: Media and Communication Studies, Political Science, Social Work, Social and Cultural Anthropology and Sociology

- **Interdisciplinary research**
  - Specific Interdisciplinary Panel

- **Medical Sciences**
  - Med1: Pharmaceutical Sciences and Medical Biochemistry
  - Med2: Bio-informatics, Genetics and Functional Genomics, Developmental and Stem Cell Biology
  - Med3: Immunology and Microbiology
  - Med4: Cancer Research
  - Med5: Neurology, Neuroscience, ENT medicine, Ophthalmology, Psychiatry
  - Med6: Respiratory System, Cardiovascular System, Hematology, Nephrology
  - Med7: Endocrinology, Gastroenterology, Hepatology, Metabolism and Nutrition, Reproduction, Urogenital System
  - Med8: Health Sciences
  - Med9: Movement & Sports Sciences, Dermatology, Physiotherapy & Rehabilitation Sciences, Dentistry and Maxillofacial Medicine, Orthopedics & Musculoskeletal Sciences, Rheumatology

- **Science and Technology**
  - W&T1: Mathematical Sciences
  - W&T2: Physics
  - W&T3: Condensed Matter
  - W&T4: Chemistry
  - W&T5: Computer Science & Information Technology
  - W&T6: Chemical and Materials Engineering
  - W&T7: Electronics, Energy, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering
  - W&T8: Sciences of the Earth and Space
  - W&T9: Science, Technology and Sociotechnical Analysis of the Built Environment
3. Evaluation & selection process
Submission to panels

• **What is new?**
  • New **Med9** panel created
  • Thorough update of the **scientific scope** of **ALL** panels
    ➔ Check these scopes carefully!
  • New approach towards **interdisciplinary research**

• **More information:**
  • [Digital brochure on FWO website](#)
  • [Webinar on FWO panel reform](#)
3. Evaluation & selection process

Submission to panels

• Specific Interdisciplinary Panel
  
  • Submitted proposals should meet the **functional definition** of interdisciplinarity:
    
    • There is more than one discipline involved, and these **disciplines** are sufficiently distinct
    
    • The disciplines are at the **same coordinated level**; each discipline is **essential** to achieve the expected outcome.
    
    • The use of different, sufficiently integrated disciplines leads to **synergy**. Due to this synergy, the **state of the art is advanced** in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area.

  ➔ Clearly **motivate** choice for Int-Dis panel using this definition
  
  ➔ Interdisciplinarity **is** assessed during the **evaluation**!
    
    • A **minimum score of 4** (‘good’) on interdisciplinarity is necessary to receive funding from this panel
    
    • It is **no longer** a requirement to combine disciplines from different scientific domains (e.g. Bio & W&T)
3. Evaluation & selection process
Submission to panels

• Multidisciplinary research proposal
  • Applicants can request one **external review** from expert with **different expertise profile** than the panel (this request is binding)
  • Examples:
    • Statistics expertise in a Bio1 (Molecular and Cellular Biology) proposal
    • Subject didactics: Physics expertise in G&M3 (Psychology, Pedagogy and Educational Sciences) proposal

  ➔ Indicate discipline in application form

  ➔ **Advice:** submit proposals to the panel with the most on-topic expertise
3. Evaluation & selection process
Submission to panels

• Evaluation of your proposal:
  • Consensus panel decisions (scoring & ranking)
• 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 (motivated)
  • 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
3. Evaluation & selection process

Score Grids

**Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Total Score (WTS)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Total Score (WTS)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final scores: panel consensus**

Weighted Total Score (WTS) -> ranking

- Team: 4
- Project: 3.5
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3. Evaluation & selection process

Score Grids Specific Interdisciplinary Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fair/Reasonable</td>
<td>Good/Very good</td>
<td>Excellent/Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Team

- The project is interdisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers at least two different disciplines, the experts, methods, tools, data, ..., of one discipline are merely used as an instrument for the other discipline. The various domains do not offer benefits to one another nor do they mutually influence each other. Instead they are juxtaposed. The outcomes of the project are thus not likely to impact all involved disciplines.

- There are some characteristics of interdisciplinarity present, but not all requirements for the category "good/very good" are met. While there is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, these disciplines are not sufficiently distinct. This is for example the case if these disciplines are located in the same FWO panel.

- Although mutual interactive input is necessary from at least two distinct disciplines to address the research question(s) under investigation, the level of coordination and integration is insufficiently extensive/profound.

- The involved disciplines do not sufficiently influence one another and as a result they do not benefit to the same extent from the project.

2/ Project

- More than one discipline involved and these disciplines are sufficiently distinct

- Disciplines at similar coordinated level and each discipline is essential to achieve expected outcome

- Advance state-of-the-art in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area

3/ Interdisciplinarity

- The project has a multidisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers at least two different disciplines, the experts, methods, tools, data, ..., of one discipline are merely used as an instrument for the other discipline. The various domains do not offer benefits to one another nor do they mutually influence each other. Instead they are juxtaposed. The outcomes of the project are thus not likely to impact all involved disciplines.

- There are some characteristics of interdisciplinarity present, but not all requirements for the category "good/very good" are met. While there is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, these disciplines are not sufficiently distinct. This is for example the case if these disciplines are located in the same FWO panel.

- Although mutual interactive input is necessary from at least two distinct disciplines to address the research question(s) under investigation, the level of coordination and integration is insufficiently extensive/profound.

- The involved disciplines do not sufficiently influence one another and as a result they do not benefit to the same extent from the project.

Total score: 25%

55%

20%
3. Evaluation & selection process

Rebuttal

• **8 – 19 September 2023**: 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 2023 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 (12 December 2023)
  - Communication on 13 December
- Results on www.fwo.be
  - Notification to all
- Contracts
  - start January 1, 2024
- 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

4

3,5

3,6
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3. Evaluation & selection process

Timeline evaluation and selection

- Submission: 3 Apr 2023
- Eligibility: Apr 2023
- Ext/Int peer review: Apr-Aug 2023
- Rebuttal: Sept 2023
- Selection and granting: Nov-Dec 2023
- Feedback: Jan 2024
- Start contract: 1 Jan 2024
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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
4. Preparing your application

E-portal – application form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Host Institution – Supervisor</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Data Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation ‘team’

Evaluation ‘project’
4. Preparing your application
E-portal – application form

Evaluation criterium ‘team’:
- Scientific capacity, track record and collaboration of
  - Supervisor(s) (spokesperson)
  - Co-supervisor(s)

Also (in CV under tab Host institutions & Supervisors) – ‘2nd axis’:
- **Research Statement**: a narrative on your scientific career in past, present and future
- **Short CV**: broad spectrum of activities (2 > 4 pages)
- **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 criterium ‘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 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 information & support:
  • Research Foundation - Flanders - Research ethics (fwo.be)

• **Non-human primates**: ethical approval procedure started before submission on April 3rd!
  • 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 after submission within your host institution (HI) and after submission by your HI
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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
Whom to contact

• First line assistance

  Biological Sciences
  +32-2-550 15 82 - bio@fwo.be
  +32-2-550 15 78

  Humanities
  +32-2-550 15 84 - cult@fwo.be
  +32-2-550 15 78

  Social Sciences
  +32-2-550 15 62 - GM@fwo.be
  +32-2-550 15 13

  Medical Sciences
  +32-2-550 15 90 - med@fwo.be
  +32-2-550 15 53
  +32-2-550 15 37

  Science and Technology
  +32-2-550 15 88 - WT@fwo.be
  +32-2-550 15 24
  +32-2-550 15 63

  Interdisciplinary research
  +32-2-550 15 25 - interdisciplinair@fwo.be

• Programme management

  – olivier.boehme@fwo.be

  – an.goris@fwo.be

  – tanja.rubbrecht@fwo.be

• E-portal/IT related issues

  – FWOhelpdesk@fwo.be
Weave:

- **Bottom-up cross-European initiative** developed by European research funders;
- To support excellent **collaborative bilateral/trilateral research projects** across borders;
- Through a **single evaluation** of the proposals;
- Based on the **Lead Agency Procedure principle**: The funder that receives the proposal (the so-called Lead Agency) evaluates the proposal according to its internal rules set out for its respective national or regional programme open for collaborative Weave projects. The funding recommendation is then communicated to the other funders involved (so-called Partner Agencies), for approval and budgetary purposes.

Initiated in 2021 and replaces past individual agreements/LAP calls FWO had with Austria, Luxembourg, Slovenia, and Switzerland (... - 2020)
Currently there are 12 participating funders in Weave:

- Austrian Science Fund/FWF
  AUSTRIA
- Research Foundation Flanders/FWO
  BELGIUM
- Czech Science Foundation/GAČR
  CZECH REPUBLIC
- Luxembourg National Research Fund/FNR
  LUXEMBOURG
- National Science Centre/NCN
  POLAND
- Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development/FORMAS
  SWEDEN
- Fund for scientific research/FNRS
  BELGIUM
- Croatian Science Foundation/HRZZ
  CROATIA
- German Research Foundation/DFG
  GERMANY
- Research Council of Norway/RCN
  NORWAY
- Slovenian Research Agency/ARRS
  SLOVENIA
- Swiss National Science Foundation/SNSF
  SWITZERLAND
Fictional example:

1. Collaborative research project in which each research group adds value. Equal project duration (for exceptions see [here](#)).

2. Submission to the Lead Agency (free choice). **Identical Weave project cannot be submitted to more than one agency in the same year.**

3. Lead Agency is solely responsible for the evaluation. **Success rate of Lead Agency applies, capped at 20%.**

4. Partner Agencies ratify the funding decision of the Lead Agency.

5. Each research funder finances its own researchers.

---

**Weave Partners**

- **Swiss Research Funder (SNSF)**
- **Austrian Research Funder (FWF)**
- **Flemish Research Funder (FWO)**

---

**Research Groups (RG)**

- **RG1**
- **RG2**
- **RG3**

---

**Weave Projects**

- Switzerland
- Austria
- Flanders
Weave Projects

FWO as LEAD Agency:

• Collaborative proposal:
  • Submitted (Use specific form: RESEARCH PROJECT WEAVE (FWO ACTS AS LEAD AGENT)) to one of the 32 FWO panels as a jr or sr research project fundamental research. Be aware that also the postdoctoral seniority of all foreign (co-)supervisors needs to be taken into account for classification in jr or sr category.
    !!Foreign partner(s) still need to make an administrative submission at the Weave research funder for which they are eligible!!
  • Evaluated in competition with all submitted FWO jr or sr research projects fundamental research.

• Flemish partner:
  • Regulations (eligibility, budget, ... ) research projects fundamental research apply, however, not possible to add non-Flemish partner for max. 10% of FWO funding.
  • Included in max. of 2 projects per application round and max. of 2 requested + running projects on the starting date of the new granted project!

• Foreign partner(s):
  • Eligibility, budget, ... according to regulations foreign research funder for which participating foreign researchers are eligible.
FWO as LEAD Agency:

Progressive FWO roll-out of Weave over the coming years:

For the current 2023 call FWO only accepts bilateral or trilateral projects with researchers from the following countries:

- Austria via FWF (Austrian Science Fund)
- French-speaking community of Belgium via F.R.S.-FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique)
- Germany via DFG (German Research Foundation)
- Luxembourg via FNR (National Research Fund)
- Poland via NCN (National Science Center)
- Slovenia via ARRS (Slovenian Research Agency)
- Sweden via FORMAS (Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development)
- Switzerland via SNSF (Swiss National Science Foundation)
Weave Projects

FWO as **PARTNER** Agency:

- **Collaborative proposal:**
  - Submitted by the responsible foreign research group at the Weave research funder (Lead Agency) for which he/she is eligible.
  
  **!!Flemish participants still need to make an administrative submission at FWO!!** Use specific form: RESEARCH PROJECT WEAVE (FWO ACTS AS PARTNER AGENT)
  - Evaluated according to the project funding scheme the Lead Agency made available for collaborative Weave projects.

- **Flemish partner:**
  - **Regulations (eligibility, budget, ...) research projects fundamental research apply.**
  - Included in max. of 2 projects per application round and max. of 2 requested + running projects on the starting date of the new granted project!

- **Foreign partner(s):**
  - Regulations (eligibility, budget, ...) foreign research funder for which foreign participating researchers are eligible.
FWO as **PARTNER** Agency:

Progressive FWO roll-out of Weave over the coming years:

In 2023 Flemish researchers can submit together with their foreign partner a **bilateral research project** at the following Weave research funders (Lead Agency) for which their foreign partner is eligible:

- **Austria** via FWF (Austrian Science Fund)
- **French-speaking Community of Belgium** via F.R.S.-FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique)
- **Germany** via DFG (German Research Foundation)
- **Luxembourg** via FNR (National Research Fund)
- **Poland** via NCN (National Science Center)
- **Slovenia** via ARRS (Slovenian Research Agency)
- **Sweden** via FORMAS (Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development)
- **Switzerland** via SNSF (Swiss National Science Foundation)
In addition – and if desired – it is possible to extend the project to a **trilateral project** because all aforementioned research funders have bilateral agreements as well with other Weave partners making the following trilateral combinations possible:

*Please be aware that within the Weave initiative only bilateral or trilateral collaborations are possible.*
Free choice where to submit:

- Success rate of the Lead Agency applies, capped at 20%. More info, see here.
- Project duration might be different depending on choice Lead Agency. More info, see here.
- Differentiation in Junior/Senior project applications only when you submit at FWO (Lead Agency).
- An identical Weave project cannot be submitted to more than one agency in the same year.
Weave Projects

More information:

• **European Weave webpage** including simulation tool: With whom can I submit what where?
• Weave-specific **FWO webpage** including more background info as well as what to do in case FWO acts as Lead Agency or Partner Agency
• FWO contacts:
  • weave@fwo.be
  • Tinne Jacobs – Advisor International Affairs – T +32 2 550 15 44 Tinne.Jacobs@fwo.be
  • Isabelle Verbaeys – Head of International Affairs – T +32 2 550 15 31 Isabelle.Verbaeys@fwo.be
  • Gregory Absillis – Science Policy Advisor International Affairs – T +32 2 550 15 29 Gregory.Absillis@fwo.be
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>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weak</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fair/reasonable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Good/very good</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excellent/outstanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. 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 not convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project. | 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 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 not 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 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 adequate to execute the proposed project. and There are some doubts on whether the available competence is sufficiently fitted to an optimal execution of the project. And (if applicable) 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/or PI’s and involved research teams evidence a growing scientific reputation. This project seamlessly fits in this progress and (if applicable) Complementary expertise and proper collaboration between research groups. | 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 fully convincing for their ability to execute the proposed project on a high level. and/or PI’s and involved research teams evidence a growing scientific reputation, for which the project could be a breakthrough. And (if applicable) 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>0</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Fair/reasonable</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Good/very good</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Excellent/outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.a. Scientific quality, relevance of the research project &amp; originality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposal contains structural flaws and/or does not offer scientific added value to the international state-of-the-art and to already ongoing research. and/or The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.b. Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specific Interdisciplinary Panel only

#### 3. Fundamental research project: scoring descriptors “Interdisciplinarity”

**Level of interdisciplinarity**

This criterion, only used in the Specific Interdisciplinary panel, invites you to assess to what extent the application is interdisciplinary. You may take both the project proposal, the profile of the applicant(s) and the research group(s) in which they will be working into account in applying this criterion. A minimum score of 4 on the aspect ‘Interdisciplinarity’ is necessary in order to be able to receive funding from the Specific Interdisciplinary Panel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair/Reasonable</th>
<th>Good/Very good</th>
<th>Excellent/Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ The project is not interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary at all. The proposed research is focused within one discipline.</td>
<td>□ The project is multidisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers at least two different disciplines, the expertise, methods, tools, data, ... of one discipline are merely used as an ‘instrument’ for the other domain. The various domains do not offer benefits to one another nor do they mutually influence each other. Instead they are juxtaposed. The outcomes of the project are not likely to impact all involved disciplines.</td>
<td>□ Some characteristics of interdisciplinarity are present, but not all requirements for the category “good/very good” are met. While there is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, these disciplines are not sufficiently distinct. This is for example the case if these disciplines are located in the same FWO panel.</td>
<td>□ There is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, and these disciplines are sufficiently distinct. □ The disciplines are at a similar coordinated level and each discipline is essential to achieve the expected outcome. □ The state of the art is advanced in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area.</td>
<td>□ There is a pronounced synergy between all involved disciplines, that strongly benefit from and mutually influence each other in an integrated and well-designed way. □ The outcomes will clearly impact all involved disciplines and as such there is substantial added value for each involved discipline and/or new bridges between previously rarely related fields are built or new subdisciplines could result from this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>