

Guidelines

for Reviewing Transfer Projects in Research Training Groups

I General Information

Transfer projects may be integrated within existing Research Training Groups (RTG). Proposals for transfer projects are reviewed on the basis of a written proposal, which may be submitted either as part of a renewal proposal for a second RTG funding period or as a supplemental proposal while the RTG is in progress.

In your review, please consider the following criteria. The explanations and questions for each criterion are illustrative.

II Review Criteria

1 Quality of the Research Training Group's prior work and assessment of further developments within a transfer project

- Please evaluate, to the extent relevant for the proposed transfer project, the scientific quality of the findings generated to date by the Research Training Group. How will this expertise be used in the transfer project?

- What is the significance of the project from a technical, economic, cultural, and/or socio-political point of view (also in relation to its cost)?
- To what extent is the transfer project an innovative transfer of the Research Training Group's findings?

2 Application partner

- Please evaluate the suitability of the application partner in relation to the proposed project.
- Is the application partner's contribution necessary and sufficient?
- For projects with commercial application partners: Is the transfer project in a pre-competitive area? Give reasons for your assessment.

3 Objectives and work programme

- Does the transfer project provide opportunities for one or more dissertations/theses?
- Are the transfer project's objectives and success criteria plausible? Can they be evaluated?
- Will the work programme be jointly supported by both the Research Training Group and the application partner?
- Please assess the extent to which the work programme is appropriate to achieve the stated objectives.

4 Working conditions and environment

Please assess whether the staff, institutional, spatial and instrumental resources are adequate to successfully undertake the project.

5 Scope of funding

- Does the work programme justify the proposed staffing requirements?
- Is the proposed instrumentation, if any, necessary for the transfer project, and will it be fully utilised by it? Can it be considered contemporary core support?

- What budget will the project need for consumables, travel and other costs? Please review the individual items in the proposal and suggest an appropriate amount, either for each item or for the total.

6 Added value for the Research Training Group

- Is the transfer project expected to have an impact on the Research Training Group? To what extent can the transfer project be linked to other projects or theses in the Research Training Group? To what extent will the other doctoral researchers also benefit from the inclusion of the transfer project?
- Does the transfer project enable the participating doctoral researchers to obtain research and professional qualifications? If so, how? Will the participating doctoral researchers be included in the qualification and supervision strategies?
- To what extent does the transfer project offer new forms of doctoral training and supervision?
- Has the role of the transfer project within the context of the Research Training Group in general been presented in a coherent and persuasive manner?
- Have adequate legal agreements been made to govern matters such as the further use and publication of the data and outcomes generated in the Research Training Group by its doctoral researchers?
- How do you rate the significance and scope of this transfer compared to other collaborations with non-university partners?
- Is a separate transfer project necessary and appropriate?

Please make a clear recommendation as to whether you believe this project should be funded.

III Additional Aspects of the Review

1 Confidentiality

All proposals submitted to the DFG, the correspondence with reviewers, the reviews and the identity of the reviewers and participating review board members must be treated confidentially.

The scientific content of a proposal you review may not be exploited for your own and/or others' scientific purposes.

2 Obligation to Observe the Principles of Good Scientific Practice¹

The principles of good scientific practice must also be observed during the review process. A violation of these principles can result in a charge of scientific misconduct. In particular, any infringement against the principles set out in “Guideline 16: Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and discussions” is considered scientific misconduct.

3 Conflicts of Interest

The DFG Head Office is not able to investigate all circumstances that could be interpreted as a conflict of interest. The DFG therefore relies on your assistance to determine whether your participation in the review meeting would be appropriate and to enable us to contact another reviewer early on if necessary.

Should circumstances exist that may be interpreted as a conflict of interest, please inform the responsible DFG staff before participating in a review meeting. If you participate in a DFG meeting without first having contacted the DFG regarding a possible conflict of interest, the DFG Head Office will assume that, to the best of your knowledge, no apparent conflict of interest exists. If you realise during or after a meeting that there may be or may have been an apparent conflict of interest, you should also contact the DFG Head Office immediately.

¹ The principles of good scientific practice are presented in detail in the DFG Code of Conduct [Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice](#).

The DFG guidelines on avoiding conflicts of interest (DFG form 10.201) can be found on the DFG website.

http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_201/

4 Diversity and Equal Opportunities in Research

In all of its funding programmes, the DFG actively promotes equal opportunities and diversity in German science and academia. Proposal reviews should not disadvantage applicants due to academically irrelevant criteria, such as age, gender or disability. Consider the applicant's scientific career development rather than his/her age. You may compensate in your evaluation for certain extra-scientific disadvantages. Unavoidable delays in an applicant's scientific career (for example longer training periods, publication gaps or less time spent abroad as a result of childcare responsibilities) should be given adequate consideration.

Further information on diversity and equal opportunities in research can be found at:

<http://www.dfg.de/diversity/en>