Guidance Notes on Funding Criteria
National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI)

The review will be based on the funding criteria as referenced in the federal-state agreement (cf. bullet points below). These criteria are supplemented by short explanatory notes and aspects to be considered. These notes are not exhaustive.

1 Readiness and Relevance of the Consortium

- Embedding of the consortium in the community of interest and integration of relevant partners
  
  Based on an analysis of the research and infrastructure environment, the proposal should describe the composition of the consortium with regard to participating users and providers, taking into account the experience/qualification of the consortium members in research data management. Furthermore, the proposal should address how the community of interest can maintain an active role in the consortium over the long term.

- Structural significance to the NFDI and the academic research system
  
  This criterion measures the suitability of the consortium’s proposed data management strategy for the community of interest with regard to the research system and the NFDI as a whole, including interdisciplinary and/or cross-methodical contributions to the NFDI.

- Capacity to coordinate activities internationally
  
  The proposal should address to what extent dialogue and networking with international infrastructure facilities/structures is relevant to the community of interest
and outline the capacity to coordinate the consortium's activities and results with such facilities/structures. It should also consider options to interoperate with international networks, for example in the development and implementation of internationally accepted standards for research data management.

2 Research Data Management Strategy

- Scientific relevance and quality of existing and planned measures
  This criterion addresses the quality of an existing or planned research-driven needs analysis. The current state and the desired state of research data management should be clearly defined in the proposal. The applicants should consider the relevance of the measures to the community of interest, taking into account the dynamic needs of their communities.

- Strategy for data use, access, findability and reusability in accordance with the FAIR principles as well as for data quality assurance
  This includes the quality of services provided to the community of interest and a structured evaluation of the implementation of the four FAIR principles and the quality assurance of research data.

- Added value to be achieved through the development of cross-disciplinary metadata standards
  Added value can be identified, for example, in an analysis of cross-disciplinary metadata standards and should be described as part of a coherent and innovative strategy for the development of relevant metadata standards.

- Creation of scientifically reliable and durable services in the consortium
  This includes, for example, contingency measures to guarantee the permanent availability of the services and data security. The services should be designed in such a way as to enable them to adapt to changing needs in the community of interest.

3 Consortium Structure and Viability

- Efficiency and longevity
  This includes the long-term viability of infrastructures the consortium is planning to integrate or depend on. The efficiency of the communication structures and the functionality of the planned organisational structures in the consortium need to remain durable and innovative over the long term.

- Operating model according to the needs of users and providers (including moderate user fees where applicable)
The scope of the consortium members’ own contributions of required resources and the appropriateness of the requested funds will be assessed, taking into consideration factors such as the operating model.