

Discipline-Specific Information Services: FIDplus

Guiding Questions for the Review



Disclaimer: The English translation of this document is provided for informational purposes. In the event of a discrepancy between the English and the German versions, the German text takes precedence.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

Kennedyallee 40 · 53175 Bonn, Germany · Postal address: 53170 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: + 49 228 885-1 · Fax: + 49 228 885-2777 · postmaster@dfg.de · www.dfg.de



The guiding questions serve as orientation to facilitate the review of proposals.

The questions are derived from the requirements set out in *FIDplus: Extension of project funding for Discipline-Specific Information Services with longer funding periods and the option of continued proposal submissions* and from the *FIDplus Indicator Framework* (DFG forms 12.23 and 12.232).

www.dfg.de/formulare/12_23

www.dfg.de/formulare/12_232

1. Orientation and performance of the FID

(see FIDplus Indicator Framework 12.232 for a more detailed explanation and contextualisation of the four dimensions)

Dimension A: Integration in the research communities

- How well do the services represent the needs of the relevant research communities?
- How do you rate the penetration of the research communities by the FID?
- How do you rate acceptance of the FID by the research communities?
- How do you rate the use of FID services by the addressed research communities?

Dimension B: Infrastructural networking

The aspect of the overall FID structure is addressed in greater detail in the section "2. Cooperation within the FID network and with other institutions".

- How well is the FID networked with other FIDs?
- What role does the FID play within the overall FID structure?
- What role does the FID play within the overall information infrastructure for the addressed research communities (also internationally)?

Dimension C: Subject-specific information orientation

- How do you rate the subject-specific information competence of the FID?
- How do you rate the integration of the FID in the strategy and portfolio of the host institutions?
- How do you rate the services as a coherent overall portfolio of the FID?
- How do you rate the FID's services in comparison with the overall information infrastructure?
- Do the services clearly go beyond basic provision and address a demonstrated subject-specific need?
- How do you rate the FID's Open Science activities and the sustainability of the resources and services provided?

Dimension D: Technological orientation

- How do you rate the technological maturity of the discipline-specific information services achieved to date?
- How do you rate the operational implementation of the FID's technical solutions?
- How do you rate the interoperability, openness and maintainability of the selected technical solutions?

2. Cooperation within the FID network and with other institutions

Note: As a frame of reference for assessing contributions to the FID network, please refer to the current version of the [FID network plan of action](#) (in German only).

- Are binding collaborations being established with other FIDs at the subject-specific or technical/infrastructural level?
- Are synergies, added value and (reciprocal) knowledge and technology transfer put to effective use?
 - *Where applicable:* At locations hosting multiple FIDs, are financial synergies clearly identified and presented?
- Are services and the information provided interoperable, and are they made available for reuse?
- How does the FID contribute to knowledge transfer and networking within an integrated and coordinated system of information provision?
- Are binding collaborations established beyond the FID network, for example with NFDI consortia, and are these put to effective use?

3. Work programme and implementation of tasks

- Is the programme for the requested funding period convincing (e.g. provision of media and information, optimised cataloguing and search systems, additional service offerings)?
- Are the measures described presented plausibly and comprehensibly?
- Are objectives and success criteria presented plausibly and convincingly?
- How do you rate the strategies and concepts for further development in the four dimensions?

Regarding the acquisition programme (depending on the orientation of the FID, not exhaustive):

- Is the acquisition profile plausible, taking into account the publication culture of the discipline?

- Is a convincing explanation provided (where appropriate drawing on examples) of how, to what extent, according to which criteria and based on which priorities media and data are acquired, catalogued and made available? Is a rationale provided for any deviations from the e-preferred policy?

Use of the requested funds

- Is a convincing rationale provided for the use of funds for all areas of work? Does the work programme justify the proposed staffing requirements?
- Is the required financial contribution sufficient and appropriately explained?
- Is sufficient information available on the projected costs of acquisitions and licensing?
 - *Where applicable:* Is the necessity of the flexible funding component convincingly demonstrated based on the acquisition concept and the content-related and strategic orientation of the FIDplus?