

Instructions and Template

for Consortia Progress Reports

National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI)

A General Instructions

Progress reports of NFDI consortia must be submitted to the DFG Head Office in PDF format via elan, the DFG's submission portal (elan.dfg.de). They consist of two parts (to be submitted in two separate PDF documents): The first part, section B-1, will be published on the DFG homepage and the NFDI community page on Zenodo¹; the second part, section B-2, will be made available only to the NFDI Expert Committee, the DFG Head Office and the NFDI Directorate. Note that PDF documents must not be larger than 10 MB or include password protection or access restrictions for reading, copying or printing. Please create a clickable table of contents for any PDF document you submit.

The following template provides a mandatory structure and a number of tables to be completed. Please adhere to this format and follow the instructions printed in grey (please delete the grey text before submission). Please note that section B-2 (all subheadings excluding the appendices) should not exceed 25 pages.

In order to take differences between the consortia into account, in particular in terms of their maturity and target group, thereby enabling a differentiated assessment, a data sheet (DFG

¹ <https://zenodo.org/communities/nfdi>

form nfdi1000) must be submitted as a supplement to each consortia progress report. Please refer to the information in the data sheet in your progress report as appropriate, or use the optional Appendix 3 “Additional comments on data sheet” for further clarification.

If you used artificial intelligence (AI) in the form of generative models for text or image creation when preparing your progress report, please disclose this in the report in a scientifically appropriate manner. See the [Portal for Research Integrity](#) for details.

Progress reports must be written in English, font Arial, 11 pt, 1.5 line spacing

The DFG privacy policy applies, see www.dfg.de/privacy_policy.

B-1 Progress Report Template Part 1, [for publication](#)

1 General Information

- **Name of the consortium**
Up to 300 characters, including spaces, no special characters.
- **Research domains² or research methods addressed by the consortium**
NFDI consortia define their scope based on the research domains or research methods they address. Please summarise research domains or research methods your consortium addresses in no more than 1,000 characters, including spaces.
- **URL of the consortium website and repositories used for publishing output**
Please provide stable links.

2 Summary

The summary describes in no more than two pages the main results and notable success stories. While the summary is a retrospective one, you may also briefly outline challenges still to be addressed. Since this summary is for publication on widely used platforms, it should be informative for a broad academic public, not only the communities served by the consortium.

² Please provide the respective names and numbers of the DFG review boards when listing the research domains.

3 Composition of the consortium

Please list all (co-)applicant institutions, (co-)spokesperson(s) and participants, each with the duration of their involvement (mm/yy - mm/yy). Please indicate ORCID-IDs, if available.

- Applicant institution

Applicant institution	Location	Duration

- Spokesperson

Spokesperson	Institution, location	Duration

- Co-applicant institutions

Co-applicant institutions	Location	Duration

- Co-spokespersons

Co-spokespersons	Institution, location	Task area(s)	Duration

- Participants

Please list the participants of the consortium in one of the two tables below, differentiating between participation as an institution or as an individual.

Participating institutions	Location	Duration
Institution 1	City 1	
Institution 2	City 2	
...		

Add lines as required. Delete this table if you have no participating institutions.

Participating individuals	Institution, location	Duration
Person 1	Affiliation of person 1	
Person 2	Affiliation of person 2	
...		

Add lines as required. Delete this table if you have no participating individuals.

B-2 Progress Report Template Part 2, for internal use only

Remember the page limit of 25 pages (excluding the appendices).

Please indicate at suitable paragraphs, how you reacted to recommendations of the NFDI Expert Committee you may have received (final section of the document *Hinweise aus Begutachtung und Beratung* that you received at the same time as the funding letter).

1 Consortium

The following subheadings correspond closely to the funding criteria on “Readiness and Relevance of the Consortium” and “Consortium Structure and Viability”. Consult the Guidance Notes on Funding Criteria (DFG form NFDI 120) for more information on the specific subheadings and the NFDI Guidelines (DFG form NFDI 100) for general information on the consortia.

If one or more members of your consortium are participating in other NFDI consortia, please list these multiple participations here, e.g.:

Member 1 is also participating in consortium X and Y

Member 2 is also participating in consortium Z

...

1.1 Composition of the consortium and its embedding in the community of interest

- Composition of the consortium

Please describe and explain changes to the consortium with respect to the partners (e.g. new partners, partners that have left the consortium) both for (co-)applicants and participating institutions and persons. How have these developments affected the work of the consortium?

- Integration of communities of interest,³ relevance for the research system

By which procedures have communities of interest been given an active role in the consortium? How have the needs of the communities been identified and how has the consortium reacted to changing needs? Please describe qualitatively, and whenever

³ Please refer to the “White Paper: Interim Report Reference” to describe the different ways in which the consortium interacts with communities. Cf. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7688729>

possible also by means of quantitative indicators, which benefits the consortium has generated for the communities that it addresses as well as for other disciplines and the research system at large.

1.2 The consortium within the NFDI / General Contribution to the development of the NFDI

How has the consortium contributed to the building of the NFDI as a whole? How have collaborations with related consortia developed? Which cross-cutting topics have been specifically addressed by this consortium? What has been achieved with respect to these cross-cutting topics and with respect to cross-cutting topics in general? How does the consortium interact with Base4NFDI and which basic services⁴ is the consortium participating in? Do you see need for improvement regarding both cross-cutting topics and basic services? How have you participated in and contributed to the governance structure of the NFDI?

1.3 International networking

How have you implemented and further developed your strategy for embedding your activities in the international context? What forms of international cooperation does the consortium pursue? How do you perceive the services you have established with a view to international activities and services in this area?

1.4 Organisational structure and viability / sustainability

Have you implemented the governance structure as foreseen in the proposal, or have you adapted and/or modified the internal structure? To what extent has the spending of funds deviated from the proposal's financial plans, especially with respect to the distribution among partners? How reliable and sustainable are infrastructures/structures that you are integrating / building on?

1.5 Operating model

- Mode of operation and financial model

⁴ "Basic services" means *Basisdienste* as defined and discussed by the expert committee in their statements in 2020 (https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/programme/nfdi/stellungnahme_nfdi_201112_de.pdf) and 2021 (https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/programme/nfdi/stellungnahme_nfdi_basisdienste.pdf).

Has your mode of operation and your financial model worked well for both providers and users? Can you share some of your experience in this regard? With a view to the perpetuation of the NFDI: What parts of the financial model have proved of value, which have not? Have you applied or observed user fees at all? If so, please share your experience in quantitative terms. Were partners' "own contributions" (in-kind and in-cash) sufficient overall?

- Data storage and computing power

Which infrastructures not funded by the NFDI with data storage and computing power have contributed in a relevant manner to the services you have developed? Please describe in quantitative terms.

2 Research Data Management Strategy

The following subheadings correspond closely to the funding criteria on the Research Data Management Strategy. Consult the Guidance Notes on Funding Criteria (DFG form NFDI 120) for more information on the specific subheadings and the NFDI Guidelines (DFG form NFDI 100) for general information. If you refer to existing information infrastructures, data repositories or reusable software, explain how they are (or were) integrated. List references in the appendix under Bibliography.

2.1 Scientific relevance and quality of the measures

How successful has the implementation of the planned measures been (with respect to the description in the proposal)? Have you achieved the aims of your task areas? How has progress related to the timeline sketched in the proposal? What deviations from or reorganisation of the work programme became necessary, possibly also due to contributions to the NFDI as a whole? What relevance do the implemented measures have for the community they address and/or for the individual members of this community? How, i.e. based on what criteria, would you measure the relevance and quality of your RDM strategy?

2.2 Metadata standards and reliable services

To which metadata standards or other RDM standards did your consortium contribute? Which reliable and sustainable services have you established? Please explain each item in some detail.

2.3 Implementation of the FAIR principles and data quality assurance

To what degree and in what way have you achieved implementation of the FAIR principles?⁵ Have your procedures and regulations for access to and use of data proved of value? How have you implemented protection of personal data? If applicable: What is the consortium's contribution to reducing uncertainties regarding General Data Protection Regulation-compliant handling of research data?

2.4 Services provided by the consortium

In describing the services currently provided by the consortium, distinguish clearly between services that consortium members provide as part of their institutional mission (*Grundaufgaben*) based on existing funding, and new services that have been established within the NFDI framework.

2.5 Impact of changes of external conditions / constraints

How have developments in the research and infrastructure landscape impacted on your work? What developments or changes were (most) relevant? How did you react to these? Please only name aspects you have not already described above.

⁵ Please refer to the "White Paper: Interim Report Reference" to describe to what degree you have achieved the implementation of the FAIR principles. Cf. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7688729>

3 Additional Aspects

- Equal opportunities and diversity are of general concern in research and not limited to individual criteria as listed above

Please explain your measures and achievements either in the preceding sections, e.g. composition of the consortium, integration of user communities, governance, quality assurance etc., and refer here to the respective paragraphs, or address the topic in full in this section.

- Reflexions and comments

What adjustments at the overarching NFDI association level, by the DFG and/or in the structural framework do you think would be useful? What need for change do you see in your consortium?

- Are there any other comments or observations from your work in the consortium that you wish to share with the expert committee?

This section is for comments or observations that do not seem to fit elsewhere.

4 Spending of Funds

Please complete the following table to show the actual spending of funds broken down by institution. List the name of each institution, adding additional lines as necessary. Add additional explanations as required.

Overall Spending by Institution

	year 1 (Oct-Dec)	year 2	year 3	year 4	year 5	year 6 (Jan-Sep)	Total in €
Institution	Totals in €						
Applicant institution							
Co-applicant institution 1							
Co-applicant institution 2							
Co-applicant institution 3							
...							
Total spending per year							

4.1 Description and Summary of Contributions by (Co-) Applicants

Research data management is an intrinsic part of the research process, and research communities rely on professional management here. (Co-) Applicant institutions are therefore expected to make appropriate financial and in-kind contributions to this area. Please describe the contributions made by the applicant and co-applicant institutions. Your listing may include contributions towards services provided by institutions as part of their institutional mission (*Grundaufgaben*) that can be used by the consortium, but be sure to distinguish them from your own contributions towards realising the work programme.

4.2 Description of the cash flow developments

Please describe how the consortium reacted to the budget cuts. How were the funds reallocated/redistributed? Which adjustments in the annual finance plans were necessary, e.g. due to changes in the composition of the consortium? Please also briefly describe any other adjustments that affected the cash flow.

Appendix

The appendix may only include the following information and documents:

1 List of outputs produced by the consortium

Please list the different kinds of outputs (in the broad sense of the classes of the FRBR-aligned Bibliographic Ontology, FaBiO⁶) that you have produced and published briefly, but including at least the following data: title, year, and persistent identifier / web link.

2 Bibliography

Please list here the references cited throughout section B.2., except your own results, which appear in the section above.

3 Additional comments on data sheet

You can include an optional appendix (max. three pages) with additional comments on your entries in the data sheet (appendix 4).

4 Data sheet

It is mandatory to fill out the *Supplementary data sheet for consortia of the National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI)* (DFG form nfdi1000). Please upload a PDF copy of the completed data sheet via elan as a separate document and additionally send the original document (Excel file) via e-mail to nfdi@dfg.de.

⁶ Cf. for the Classes <https://sparontologies.github.io/fabio/current/fabio.html#classes>.