FIDplus Indicator Framework: Preamble

Overall objective: The overall objective of the review is to assess the effectiveness and prospects of success of the services that have been established. For this reason, these two aspects are not addressed separately, but are to be taken into account as part of the overall assessment of the dimensions and guiding questions.

Perspective of the guiding questions: The guiding questions are formulated from the perspective of the review.

Weighting of dimensions / funding requirements: As the indicator framework is designed to include both quantitative and qualitative elements, with qualitative indicators predominating, no weighting of the dimensions should be applied in the review. However, convincing integration in the community (Dimension A) is a necessary prerequisite for FIDplus funding. Without a convincing performance in Dimension A, it is not possible to make a funding recommendation under FIDplus, even if excellent results are achieved in the other dimensions.

Individual focus areas: The guiding questions used in the review must always be answered on the basis of the data and information provided and must be fully, comprehensively and transparently assessable for the reviewers. Due to the differing subject-specific and strategic orientations of the various discipline-specific information services, as well as the diverse needs of the individual target groups addressed, discipline-specific information services can vary considerably. For this reason, the indicator framework has to allow for differing priorities. However, it remains central and mandatory for the proposal to address all indicators in substantive terms. Deviations are permitted only in justified exceptional cases. Any deviation from, or omission of, individual indicators is permitted only if duly justified.

Data collection standards: Cross-cutting standards for data collection, in particular usage indicators, are developed by statutory bodies within the overall structure of the discipline-specific information services (FID). These standards are intended to serve as a model. Alternative data collection methods remain possible, but should be stated and justified separately, where applicable.

Communities as target groups that may potentially use the FID The term "community" is deliberately used only in the plural within the indicator framework, as discipline-specific information services usually address more than one community. It is the responsibility of the discipline-specific information services to identify the communities addressed in the proposal and describe their relationship to these communities. This should also include a description of the size of the communities addressed and the service's own expectations regarding market penetration. This information is to enable reviewers to assess both the level of market penetration already achieved and that being targeted.

Services: The term "service(s)" refers to all offerings created by the FID, regardless of whether they are directed at the target groups addressed, other discipline-specific information services or additional actors in the field of information infrastructures.

Open Science: Each FIDplus is expected to demonstrate a clear commitment to Open Science. It is often the case that activities in the area of Open Science (see Indicator C6) cannot be funded through the FID programme itself, but require funding to be applied for as so-called "satellite projects" under other LIS programmes. The fact that project funding for such activities largely lies outside the FID programme should be taken into account when completing the indicator and in the corresponding review.

Methodological quality of data collection For all guiding questions, the methodological quality of data collection by the FID should also be examined and assessed as part of the review.

Role of the data sheet The key figures to be recorded in the data sheet and their contextualisation in the proposal should correspond to the quantitative and qualitative nature of the indicators in each case. In the proposal, the discipline-specific information service provides an interpretation of the key figures in relation to the indicator framework, and this must be convincing in the review.

No.	Guiding questions for the review	Indicators	Notes for reviewers

No.	Guiding questions for the review	Indicators	Notes for reviewers

Dimension A: Integration in the research communities

No.	Guiding questions for the review	Indicators	Notes for reviewers
A1	How well do the services represent the needs of the relevant research communities?	Needs analyses Usage scenarios drawn from the communities	*How well does the service portfolio cover the needs identified? How well has the FID understood the needs of the research communities?* Expectation: Systematic feedback from the research communities must be ensured. Examples: Surveys; literature analyses; feedback from an academic advisory board; feedback on services
A2	How do you rate the penetration of the research communities by the FID?	Outreach and visibility activities (e.g. academic conferences, tutorials, advisory services, workshops, public relations activities, promotion of services, participation in research-related committees and academic bodies) Measurement of success in terms of contacts with research communities	*Are the methods used to reach the research communities effective and promising? How visible is the FID within the research communities? What does the FID do to ensure that it is perceived by the research communities? Are the measures appropriate to the research communities in question (e.g. are the right conferences attended)?* Expectation: The FID engages actively with the research communities. Examples: Description of the range and frequency of activities and the extent to which they are taken up by the research communities
A3	How do you rate acceptance of the FID by the research communities?	Analysis of awareness and acceptance of the services Impact analysis Cooperations and cooperation requests Participation in projects or committees	*Is the FID an important and reliable partner to research? Does the FID have a good reputation within the research communities?* Expectation: The FID is an important partner to research. Examples: Letters of support for cooperations; representation of the FID at conferences and research community meetings
A4	How do you rate the use of FID services by the addressed research communities?	Usage analysis of individual services and over time, in relation to the size of the research communities	*Is usage stable, increasing or declining? Can explanations be provided?* Expectation: The FID is used frequently and comprehensively (across all services).
A5	How do you rate the strategies and concepts for further development of the demand-oriented focus of the FID?	Development strategy Operational strategy (work plan) for future funding	*Is the FID able to adapt to new research communities or emerging needs? Is the FID capable of continually attracting researchers in early career phases?* Expectation: The FID responds to the changing needs of its research communities.

Dimension B: Infrastructural networking

No.	Guiding questions for the review	Indicators	Notes for reviewers
B1	How well is the FID networked with other FIDs?	Contacts and networking activities (e.g. cooperations)	*What synergies can be created, and how?* Expectation: The FID is well connected and diversely networked within the overall FID structure.
B2	What role does the FID play within the overall FID structure?	Activities (e.g. provision and reuse of FID services, active participation in and shaping of the governance of the overall FID structure, standardisation initiatives)	*What is the FID's contribution to the overall FID structure?* Expectation: The FID is an important partner within the overall FID structure and contributes to its further development.
B3	What role does the FID play within the overall information infrastructure for the addressed research communities (also internationally)?	Contacts and networking activities (e.g. cooperations, participation in (international) bodies)	What synergies can be created, and how? Are other stakeholders in the information landscape known? Expectation: The FID is familiar with other information infrastructures serving the research communities and makes an important contribution to information provision within the broader landscape.
B4	How do you rate the strategies and concepts for the further development of the FID's infrastructural networking?	Development strategy Operational strategy (work plan) for future funding	*Does the FID adapt to the changing information infrastructure and develop strategies to continue playing a role in information provision in the future?* Expectation: The FID is able to adapt to and respond to changes in the information infrastructure.

Dimension C: Subject-specific information orientation

C1	How do you rate the subject-specific information competence of the FID?	Qualifications and expertise of the applicant institutions Subject-specific information competence of the staff	*Is there subject-specific expertise within the FID?* Expectation: The FID is appropriately equipped in terms of subject expertise and staffing.
C2	How do you rate the integration of the FID in the strategy and portfolio of the host institutions?	Strategy of the applicant institutions	*Does the FID fit into the priorities and fields of activity of the host institutions? How is the FID integrated in the portfolio of the host institutions? Is the FID part of the institutions' strategic orientation?* Expectation: The FID is integral to the institutions' strategic development.
C3	How do you rate the services as a coherent overall portfolio of the FID?	Concept for an overall portfolio taking account of the market and the environment	*Is the portfolio effective? Is a well-functioning one-stop shop offered? Are the services internally coherent? How well coordinated are the individual FID services and how do you rate their quality?* Expectation: The FID has a convincing overall concept for its service portfolio.
C4	How do you rate the FID's services in comparison with the overall information infrastructure?	Market and environmental analysis	*Are redundancies with other services avoided? Are services offered as an alternative to commercial services in order to ensure diversity in the market? Is the service of key relevance?* Expectation: Redundancies should be avoided, in particular with other publicly funded services.
C5	Do the services clearly go beyond basic provision and address a demonstrated subject-specific need?	Service profile; collection or access profile, where applicable	If the FID builds collections or provides access to resources, does the FID's collection go beyond the basic provision of university libraries? Are services offered that go beyond basic provision at university libraries? Expectation: The FID covers the specialised needs of the subject-specific research communities.
C6	How do you rate the FID's Open Science activities and the sustainability of the resources and services provided?	Evidence of open access within the overall offering (e.g. share of open access resources, advisory services on open access); evidence of research data (management) within the overall offering (e.g. share of research data, advisory services on research data management) Number of resources made referenceable by the FID (PID), sustainable licences for electronic resources in relation to the overall offering	*Does the FID provide evidence of open access resources or are there best practices for dealing with open access? Are there best practices for research data management or for the reproducibility of research results? Are there services for the archiving of corpora or for improving access to open access material through indexing and metadata enrichment? Is there cooperation with KfL?* Expectation: The FID contributes to the openness and sustainability of the resources and services it provides.
C7	How do you rate the strategies and concepts for the further development of the FID's subject-specific information orientation?	Further development strategy Operational strategy (work plan) for future funding	*How do you rate the FID's capacity for subject-specific adaptation and innovation? Can the FID respond to changes in the subject communities and in the information landscape?* *Expectation: The FID is able to adapt to and respond to current developments in the information landscape.*

Dimension D: Technological orientation

D1	How do you rate the technological maturity of the discipline-specific information services achieved to date?	Technical basis of the services	*Do the technical infrastructures correspond to the state of the art? Is the technical infrastructure operable as a production system?* Expectation: The FID is to meet the established technical state of the art. Example: In its technical services, the FID follows the recommendations of the Technology Board. Unsupported technology versions are no longer to be used and are to be phased out.
D2	How do you rate the operational implementation of the FID's technical solutions?	Development process Technical cooperation with other FIDs and other partners	*How does the FID develop its services: in-house development, reuse or procurement? Are there processes for addressing migration requirements? Are there institutional constraints?* Expectation: The FID has a clearly defined process for the development, migration and maintainability of its services.
D3	How do you rate the interoperability, openness and maintainability of the selected technical solutions?	Use of open-source software Open interfaces	*How does the FID position itself with regard to the interoperability recommendations of the FID Technology Board? Are cross-FID technical standards used? How well are open-source solutions documented, particularly those developed by the FID?* Expectation: The FID works as far as possible with open and interoperable technologies in order to ensure exchangeability and maintainability.
D4	How do you rate the strategies and concepts for the further development of the FID's technological orientation?	Further development strategy Operational strategy (work plan) for future funding	*How do you rate the FID's technological adaptability and capacity for innovation? Does the FID have a forward-looking perspective, for example with regard to the planned integration of new versions?* Expectation: The FID is able to adapt to current technological developments and has strategies in place to respond to technical change.