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1. INTRODUCTION

The instructions in this evaluation handbook are designed to assist you in your assignment as a reviewer for the Council for Research Infrastructures. The handbook contains guidelines on how evaluation and grading of applications concerning research infrastructures should be carried out. It also includes information about the Swedish Research Council’s general guidelines and the policies specific to the Council for Research Infrastructures. You will also find practical instructions on how to use the web-based tool VR-Review when rating your applications and on how to write the evaluations that are sent to applicants.

The reviewing of applications is an important part of the Council for Research Infrastructure’s activities, which complements the Council’s other assignments such as drawing up strategies, performing evaluations and following up research infrastructures. As a member of one of the Council for Research Infrastructure’s evaluation panels you have an important assignment. Welcome as a reviewer with the Council for Research Infrastructures.

Juni Palmgren
Secretary General
Council for Research Infrastructures
2. NEWS 2014

Changes concerning research infrastructures

- The Research Council has initiated a project during 2014 for reviewing the handling of prioritising, financing, organising and managing research infrastructures. New infrastructures will not be funded before this work is completed. A number of large national infrastructures whose operation grant expires in 2014 will be prolonged for one year. Other infrastructures whose grant (operation or large databases) expires in 2014 have the possibility to apply for a one year prolongation. Applications for planning grant and Swedish participation in international infrastructures are not affected.
- Special calls will be published during 2014 for biological/medical mass spectrometry and microscopy, and for Swedish in-kind contribution to the infrastructure FAIR, Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research.

General news

- A new policy for handling conflicts of interests will be adopted by the Research Council’s board in April 2014 and then gradually implemented.
3. HANDLING PROCEDURE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE APPLICATIONS 2014

Since the only open calls for Research infrastructure grants in 2014, due to a review of the Research Council’s infrastructure handling, are for planning or Swedish participation in international research infrastructures, the procedure for assessing applications is somewhat different this year.

Applications for Infrastructure – Operation grant (participation in international research infrastructure), Infrastructure – Grant for expensive scientific equipment (participation in international research infrastructure) and Infrastructure – Planning grant, is assessed and rated by at least one of RFI’s evaluation panels and one or more of the scientific councils’ panels, and in some cases by external reviewers, in accordance with Assessment of RI applications below. Each application should normally, according to the Swedish Research Council’s directions, be assessed by at least three members within each panel, but since research infrastructure applications always are assessed by both the scientific council’s panels and RFI’s panels, the infrastructure applications should be assessed by at least two reviewers in each RFI panel. One of RFI’s evaluation panels has primary responsibility for the application, but other panels can be consulted in their respective areas of expertise.

Applications for Infrastructure – Operation grant (prolonged grant for national infrastructure), which concerns prolonged operations grant at the same level as in 2014, are only assessed by at least one of RFI’s evaluation panels and not by the scientific council’s panels.

The review in RFI’s panels

Anyone reviewing an application will rate the application, rank it and write an assessment in VR-Review (see page 14). One member, the proposer, formulates a draft proposal to the group’s joint statement and takes care of filing the group’s final statement in VR-review after the panel meeting. Sometimes external reviewers are engaged as experts; they should both rate the applications and submit a written statement which will serve as a basis for the discussion in RFI’s evaluation panels. Statements from external reviewers will be deleted after the decision is taken and will not be sent to the applicant. The RFI panel that has primary responsibility for the application writes a joint statement, sets the grades to all criteria and makes a priority list based on their own assessment and the discussion at the meeting including any strategic considerations. The group’s statement should reflect that the assessments from the scientific councils and any external reviewers have been taken into account. In the group’s final statement, which will be sent to the applicant, differences in assessment between the different groups should be commented on, and it should be clearly described which considerations led to the proposed decision to grant or reject the application. The panel may, if it is considered relevant, propose specific requirements for the application to be granted or suggest budget cuts. The panel should make one priority list for planning grants and one for all other types of grants, and they should only rank the applications that have a chance of receiving funding.

The panels are responsible for all applications that are handled by them, and all should be reviewed based on their own qualifications. No application may be given lower priority on the grounds that it doesn’t fall exactly within the groups’ area of expertise.

RFI’s joint panel and decision

The priority lists from RFI’s five panels are processed by a joint panel (RFI-sam), normally constituted by the panel chairs of the individual panels. At its meeting, RFI-sam compiles a joint proposal. The joint panel will also determine which final statement the application should receive, either by choosing an existing statement (usually from the panel with primary responsibility for the application) or by writing a new one
clarifying which aspects form the basis for the revised assessment. RFI decides which applications are to be funded at the council meeting in November.

Handling of conflicts of interest

Any conflict of interest must be reported, and anyone found to have a conflict of interest regarding a particular application cannot be involved in the handling of that application. The person with a conflict of interest must leave the room and the conflict of interest shall be recorded in the meeting minutes. The minutes shall also document situations where a possible conflict of interest was discussed, but found not to exist.

In exceptional cases where one or more of the panel members are strongly linked to a proposed infrastructure, in addition to following the rules of procedure in the Conflict of interest policy, assessments from at least two external reviewers must be obtained.

If a member of the panel participates in an application or has a close relationship to one of the applicants, and the application cannot obtain an adequate assessment in another panel, the member shall not participate in the handling of applications for the current year.

For further instructions, see Conflict of interest policy, page 19.

External reviewers

An external reviewer is defined as an individual who reviews grant applications on behalf of an evaluation panel (or other review entity), but who is not an elected member. An external reviewer may be a member of another evaluation panel, or could be someone outside of the Swedish Research Council’s review organisation. It is often advantageous to appoint a foreign expert as an external reviewer.

External reviewers are costly, both in terms of consulting fees and the time used to recruit and support them in the review process. Therefore, external reviewers should be used restrictively. In addition to the external reviewers needed to prevent conflict-of-interest situations, it is recommended that no more than one external reviewer be appointed per ten applications handled by the panel. If possible, they should be asked to review more applications to build a basis for comparison. Hence, a panel that reviews 100 applications should not appoint more than 10 external reviewers in addition to those needed to prevent conflicts of interest.

An external reviewer should assess grant applications in basically the same way as the evaluation panel does (and submit written comments and grades). Evaluations submitted by individual reviewers to the Swedish Research Council serve as a basis for the evaluation panel and will not be available after decision is taken. In some cases, it is possible to ask another evaluation panel as a whole to submit advisory opinions, those are considered public documents and will be released upon request.

The evaluation panel, or its chair, can identify situations that require external review and may propose potential reviewers. Normally, the person in charge of the evaluation panel at the Swedish Research Council will contact the proposed external reviewers. External reviewers may not submit grant applications of their own to the evaluation panel they serve, and they must have no conflicts of interest with the applicants to be assessed.

External review is obligatory when applicants are members of the Swedish Research Council’s decision-making bodies (RFI or the board), where at least two external evaluations are required as a basis for a decision. Other typical cases that involve external reviewers include:

- Conflict-of-interest situations within the evaluation panel – the intent here is to confirm that even a completely independent review would yield approximately the same results.
- The scientific content of the application is such that the evaluation panel’s collective knowledge is insufficient for a complete review.

The main principle is that the evaluation panels are fully responsible for the final assessment of an application and the recommended decision. External reviewers are not substitutes for reviewers in the panel.
Assessment of infrastructure applications 2014

The applications for Infrastructure – Operation grant (participation in international research infrastructure), Infrastructure – Grant for expensive scientific equipment (participation in international research infrastructure) and Infrastructure – Planning grant are evaluated in three stages. First, scientific quality is evaluated by the scientific councils’ or committees’ evaluation panels, or, when needed, by external reviewers. These evaluations then serve as the basis for a strategic assessment of the infrastructure applications by the evaluation panels of RFI. In the third stage, a joint panel composed of representatives of all five of RFI’s evaluation panels (most commonly the chairs) prepares documentation for a decision by RFI. At its meeting in November, RFI decides which applications are to be granted or rejected.

Applications for Infrastructure – Operation grant (prolonged grant for national infrastructure), which concerns prolonged operations grant at the same level as in 2014, are assessed by at least one of RFI’s evaluation panels and not by the scientific council’s panels.

The division of responsibility between the evaluation panels of the scientific councils and RFI’s panels is such that the scientific evaluation is primarily done by evaluation panels of the scientific councils, while the RFI groups are responsible for the evaluation of the long-term and general strategic significance and how well the application meets the Research Council’s criteria for research infrastructure. The panel with the primary responsibility for the application is responsible for ensuring that the application is given a proper evaluation (i.e. it should request supplemental evaluations by outside reviewers, when necessary).

Step 1 – Evaluation by the evaluation panels of the scientific councils

Every application must be given a scientific assessment by at least one of the evaluation panels of the scientific councils, or if this is not possible, then by at least two external reviewers. These evaluation panels’ evaluations should be submitted before the assessment in RFI’s evaluation panels.

The written evaluations submitted by the evaluation panels of the scientific councils must contain a rating and a written explanation for the following criteria:

a) Novelty and originality
An assessment of the novelty and originality of both the research intended to be supported by the infrastructure, and the infrastructure to which the application applies.

A seven-grade rating scale is used:
Outstanding 7
Excellent 6
Very good to excellent 5
Very good 4
Good 3
Weak 2
Poor 1

b) Scientific quality of the proposed research
An assessment of the scientific quality of the research that the infrastructure is intended to support.

A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.

c) Merits of the applicant(s)
An assessment of the applicant(s) qualifications and expertise. In this criterion, expertise in constructing and/or operating an infrastructure according to the description in the application, as well as academic research qualifications, should be considered.

A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.
d) Feasibility
An assessment of the feasibility of the infrastructure proposed in the application.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Feasible 3
Partly feasible 2
Not feasible 1

e) Summary assessment of the scientific quality of the application
A summary rating that reflects a comprehensive evaluation of the ratings for a) to d). An explanation for this assessment must be provided under f).
A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.

f) Written explanation of the summary rating
An explanation of the summary rating, e), which clearly describes the considerations that led to the decision. The evaluation panel’s evaluation will be sent to the applicant together with the decision.

g) Potential users
An estimate of the number of qualified users that may use the infrastructure.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Broad national and/or international use 3
Some national and/or international use 2
Foremost local use 1

h) Relevance of the infrastructure
An assessment of the relevance of the infrastructure to the research that the infrastructure is intended to support.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Very high 3
High 2
Low 1

Step 2 – Evaluation by RFI’s evaluation panels
Applications are assessed by RFI’s evaluation panels, which also submit evaluations. An application can be processed by several evaluation panels.
The written evaluations submitted by RFI’s evaluation panels must contain a rating and a written explanation for the following criteria:

a) To what extent does the infrastructure fulfil the criteria for a national infrastructure?
An assessment of the degree to which the infrastructure satisfies RFI’s criteria for infrastructure. The infrastructure should:
• Be of broad national interest,
• provide the potential for world-class research,
• be used by several research groups/users with highly advanced research projects,
• be so extensive that individual groups cannot manage them on their own,
• have a long-term plan addressing scientific goals, financing, and utilisation,
• be open and easily accessible for researchers, industry, and other actors, and have a plan for accessibility (concerning infrastructure use, access to collected data, and presentation of results)
and,
• if relevant, introduce new cutting edge technology.
A three-grade rating scale is used:
Completely 3
Partly 2
Not at all 1

b) **Novelty and originality**
An assessment of the novelty and originality of both the research intended to be supported by the infrastructure, and the infrastructure to which the application applies.

A seven-grade rating scale is used:
Outstanding 7
Excellent 6
Very good to excellent 5
Very good 4
Good 3
Weak 2
Poor 1

c) **Scientific quality of the proposed project**
An assessment of the technical and organisational quality of the infrastructure to which the application applies.

A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.

d) **Qualifications and expertise of the applicant**
An assessment of the applicant(s) qualifications and expertise. In this criterion, both expertise in constructing and/or operating an infrastructure according to the description in the application, and academic research qualifications should be considered.

A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.

e) **Feasibility**
An assessment of the feasibility of the infrastructure proposed in the application.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Feasible 3
Partly feasible 2
Not feasible 1

f) **Potential users**
An estimate of the number of qualified users that may use the infrastructure.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Broad national and/or international use 3
Some national and/or international use 2
Foremost local use 1

g) **Relevance of the infrastructure**
An assessment of the relevance of the infrastructure to the research which the infrastructure is intended to support.

A three-grade rating scale is used:
Very high 3
High 2
Low 1
h) **Summary assessment of the application**
A summary rating that reflects a comprehensive evaluation of the ratings for a) to g), including strategic considerations, if relevant. An explanation for this assessment must be provided under i).

A seven-grade rating scale is used, see above.

i) **Written explanation of the summary rating**
A written explanation of the summary rating, h), which clearly describes the considerations that led to the grade. It is important that the grounds used to evaluate the application are stated. Any differences between quality grades and prioritization should be specifically commented, as should those cases in which RFI’s evaluation panels reached a different conclusion than the scientific council’s evaluation panels. The evaluations from the evaluation panels will be used as documentation when compiling a final prioritization list. The evaluations will also be sent to the applicants together with the decision.

**Step 3 – Appraisal and decision**
On the basis of the evaluations of the evaluation panels, RFI’s joint panel should establish a prioritization list. The group should take into consideration long-term strategic considerations during the appraisal.

Based on the recommendations from the joint panel, and financial considerations, RFI makes decisions regarding allocation between various forms of grants, and whether or not to approve individual applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 26</td>
<td>Deadline for applications – Planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26-27</td>
<td>RFI meeting, panel members and delegates to the joint evaluation panel (RFI-sam) are appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>Meeting with all the chairs and members to the RFI evaluation panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23</td>
<td>Deadline for applications – Operation grant (participation in international research infrastructure), Operation grant (prolonged grant for national infrastructure) and Grant for expensive scientific equipment (participation in international research infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>Distribution of applications to reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>Applications to the scientific council’s panels (planning grant and participation in international research infrastructures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28</td>
<td>Deadline for the scientific council’s panels to indicate reviewers on RFI applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21-22</td>
<td>RFI meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>Last day to order applications via print-on-demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>Last day to report conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 17-18</td>
<td>RFI meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 25 –Sep 25</td>
<td>The scientific council’s panels meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 30</td>
<td>Last day for the scientific council’s panels to deliver their reviews on infrastructure applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10-14</td>
<td>RFI’s evaluation panels meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20</td>
<td>Deadline for RFI’s evaluation panels to deliver their reviews to RFI-sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 28</td>
<td>RFI-sam meets and provides a priority list to the RFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12-13</td>
<td>RFI meeting, decision on which applications to fund or reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>RFI meeting, possible additional grant decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec</td>
<td>Notifications of grant decisions and rejection letters are sent to applicants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1. ASSESSMENT AND RATING

DG DECISION NO 2012-1

The Swedish Research Council has decided that in assessments of applications from the start of 2012, the evaluation panels must use a common rating scale based on the scientific quality of four basic assessment criteria (basic criteria). A seven-grade scale is to be used for three of the four basic criteria, as well as for a summary review of the application. The fourth assessment criterion (feasibility) is rated using a three-grade scale. Partial ratings are to be weighted together to give a summary rating that reflects the collected assessment of the scientific quality of the application, after the application has been discussed at the meeting of the evaluation panel.

Basic criteria for assessment of scientific quality

On a seven-grade scale

Novelty and originality
Scientific quality of the proposed research
Merits of the applicants(s) (refers to competence for the implementation of the proposed project, including co-workers)

On a three-grade scale

Feasibility

Rating scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Exceptionally strong applications with negligible weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very strong application with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD TO EXCELLENT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very strong application with minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong application with minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviewer may also choose “Insufficient”, if there is not sufficient information in the application with which to assess quality.
For the criterion *Feasibility*, a three-grade scale is thus used:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEASIBLE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTLY FEASIBLE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case as well, the reviewer is to mark “Insufficient” when there is not sufficient information with which to assess the criterion concerned.

Please note that the above rating scales are *ordinal scales* (that is, with an undefined “distance” between the values); it is therefore not relevant to provide a mean value. In the evaluation of the applications, medians are used.
Thank you for joining the Swedish Research Council’s review organisation.

**What is VR-Review?**

VR-Review is a web-based tool that contains both a database (electronic archive) and a management system for review work. Proposals for research grants sent in to the Research Council are stored in the database, in the form of PDF files, which can be viewed with the Adobe Acrobat Reader program (www.adobe.se). You can access VR-Review online at [http://vrreview.vr.se/](http://vrreview.vr.se/) or by following the link at www.vr.se. A guide to using VR-Review is provided at the end of this document.

**Who does what in the review process?**

Proposals are distributed among evaluation panels after being sent to the Research Council’s web-based application system, VR-Direct. As a member of an evaluation panel, you then use VR-Review to read the proposals allocated to you. Other material may be sent out, depending on the subject area you work in. If you work as an external reviewer (i.e. are not a member of the evaluation panel), VR-Review works in such a way that only the proposals you have been asked to review are visible on your computer monitor.

If, as a member of the evaluation panel, you prefer to read proposals in paper format, you can order them after you have logged in to VR-Review, under the ‘My information’ menu option.

All reviewers must register their reviews (in the form of preliminary evaluations, assessment notes and external reviews) in VR-Review.

- The evaluator fills in the ‘Preliminary evaluation’ form.
- The other reviewers in the evaluation panel fill in the ‘Assessment note’ form.
- External reviewers fill in the ‘External review’ form.

As a precaution, we recommend that you also save copies of your work on your own computer in, for example, a word-processing program like MS Word.

No material contained in VR-Review may be made available to unauthorised persons. The evaluation panel must issue a joint evaluation on every proposal after the evaluation panel meeting. The evaluation is, after decisions have been taken, a public document that may be issued to anyone who requests them. Preliminary evaluations, assessment notes and the external reviewers’ statements will be sorted out before funding decision and cannot be disclosed.

When the evaluation panel embarks on its prioritisation, the work is done in VR-Review. Finally, the priorities, evaluations and preliminary decisions are registered. These, in turn, serve as a basis for the decisions of the Scientific Council or Committee concerned on which proposals are to be awarded grants.

**How do you work in VR-Review?**

**A. Your computer**

For the work to proceed as smoothly as possible, the following technical requirements need to be fulfilled. These requirements apply regardless of which platform or operative system you use.

**Basic requirements:**

- Your computer must be connected to the Internet for you to be able to use VR-Review.
• You must have a modern web browser, which must be configured to allow JavaScript.
• You must have software installed that can read PDF files (PDF version 1.4 or later).
• You must allow http://vrreview.vr.se to use ‘session cookies’.

The Swedish Research Council recommends:
• For PC: The Internet explorer web browser 8 and 9, the Firefox web browser 10-18.
• For MAC: The Firefox web browser 10-18, the Safari web browser 5-6.
• The Acrobat Reader program (version 7 or later) for reading PDF files.
• An Internet connection of at least 128 Kbps, with an ADSL modem.
• Not using a proxy server (disabling your proxy server, if any) when you are using VR-Review.
• Allowing pop-ups for http://vrreview.vr.se.

If you are unsure how to follow the above instructions, please contact the person in charge of computer services at your department or equivalent.

B. Overview menu headings
VR-Review is based on a number of different menu headings which are found in the left-hand margin. Please note that the menus available depend on which access rights you have been assigned for your evaluation panel/s. Some of the menus described below may therefore not be displayed in your case.

My information
This is where you fill in your personal information, bank account details for remuneration, details for delivery and choice of format for material from the evaluation panel. This must be filled in before you start your assessment.

My evaluation panels
This is where the evaluation panels in which you participate in one way or another are described. You choose panel by clicking its name in the left-hand menu. Detailed information about the evaluation panel, including members and important dates/deadlines, will be displayed and you will be able to see and read all the proposals that the panel has been assigned. This is also where the Notice board/Anslagstavlan is found, where different documents can be uploaded for communication to and/or within the evaluation panel.

Administer proposals
This is where the proposals within an evaluation panel are assigned to reviewers.

Conflicts of interest
This is where you indicate to which of the panel’s proposals you have a conflict of interest during the period when the system is open for reporting conflicts of interest. The duration of this period is listed under the menu heading “My evaluation panels”.

My proposals to review
This is where you find a list of the proposals that you will read and write an assessment for. If you have been assigned to be evaluator of a proposal, this is also where you submit the joint evaluation from the panel after its meeting.

Priority
This is where preliminary financing and other priorities are indicated. The function is available for the evaluation panel administrators only.
All evaluation panels
This is where you find all evaluation panels of the Swedish Research Council including their assigned proposals for the current year.

Reports
This is where evaluation panel members may order reports on proposals and assessments. The reports are sent by e-mail to the email address you have specified.

Settings
This is where you can change your password to VR-Review. You can also choose to see proposals to the Swedish Research Council from previous years.

C. This is the procedure:
• Go to http://vrreview.vr.se. Log in with the username and password given on the first page of this document. The best way to start is by reading the ‘Help’ section in the left-hand menu.
• Click on ‘My information’ in the left-hand menu. Here, you fill in your personal particulars, account details for any remuneration, and information for any proposals sent to you by post. Then click on the Save key.
• Under the ‘Settings’ option you can alter the various settings, such as your password.
• Click on ‘My Evaluation Panels’. A list of the evaluation panels you belong to will come up. When you click one of these panels, you get a list of the panel members and a notice board with joint documents for the panel concerned. On the right-hand side of the web page, you also see the dates relating to the review work. Note that the dates may vary from one evaluation panel to another. Here you will be able to see and read all the proposals that the panel has been assigned, if you are a member of the evaluation panel.
• Click on ‘Conflict of interest’. A list of all the proposals being dealt with by the evaluation panel is shown. Here, where applicable, you can mark the proposal(s) that entail a conflict of interest for you. When you click on ‘>>’ for the proposal concerned, you obtain more information about the proposal and a PDF icon for the actual proposal and its data sheet. In this screen, you should report any conflict of interest by inserting a cross in a box and perhaps adding comments on the conflict of interest concerned.
• Under the menu option ‘My proposals to review’ is a list of the proposals for which you are either the evaluator or a reviewer. When you click (on the symbol ‘>>’) for the proposal concerned, you find more information about the proposal and a PDF icon that you can click on to view the actual proposal and the data sheet that goes with it. Here, you will also find the form in which you enter your assessment of the proposal. Before a specified date you must:
  o as the evaluator, fill in the ‘Preliminary evaluation’ form
  o as a reviewer, fill in the ‘Assessments note’ form
  o as an external reviewer (not a member of the evaluation panel), fill in the ‘External review’ form.

Do not hesitate to contact your administrator (see www.vr.se “Call for proposals” for telephone number or e-mail) if you have any questions about the implementation or management of the review process.

Thank you for your assistance in reviewing proposals!
APPENDIX 3. GENERAL GUIDELINES

General Guidelines from the Board of the Swedish Research Council to Scientific Councils other Councils and Committees for Evaluations in 2013

The following general guidelines from the Swedish Research Council apply to the Scientific Councils and other councils and committees (SCCCs) in evaluating grant applications prior to funding decisions.

10.1 Applications that bridge or overlap subject areas
Every SCCC is to take full responsibility to assure that each application receives sufficient review. This includes grant applications that fall on the borderline with other SCCCs within the Swedish Research Council, or on the borderline with other research funding bodies. Applications that involve multiple SCCCs must be jointly addressed so that those involved reach a consensus opinion prior to the funding decision. From 2014 onwards, a special review process for interdisciplinary research will be determined. The process relates only to those applications whose subject areas span more than one scientific council/committee area.

10.2 Researchers in early career stages/researcher recruitment
While maintaining high quality standards, SCCCs are to give high priority to initiatives that aim to provide favourable conditions for researchers early in their careers. As a benchmark 1/3 of the annually decided total sum for project funding and funding of employment and scholarships (forms of grant in accordance with appendix 2 of the annual report of the Swedish Research Council) for every SCCC should be allocated to young researchers, meaning researchers who have a career age of less than 8 years. If the decided amount differs substantially from this benchmark this should be justified. The total sum for these forms of grant concerns all decisions made during the year, regardless of the origin of the funds. The total sum per SCC must also include the Director General’s decisions regarding International Postdoc and International Career Grant (INCA).

10.3 Increased long-term perspective
The SCCC should make initiatives to increase the long-term perspective and strengthen the prerequisites for research by striving for higher average funding amounts and longer average funding periods. These actions should be taken in a way that does not worsen the prerequisites for junior researchers to receive funding nor threaten gender equality. The Secretary Generals should present recommendations for funding decisions so that the average funding level and the average funding period are made clear prior to decision. Written statements about the development of these factors should be added to the decision of the SCCC. The statement should be included in the Secretary Generals’ reporting to the Board.

10.4 Assessing budget and indirect costs
The grants of the Swedish Research Council for research projects at universities and university colleges must include financing for direct and indirect costs in the same proportions as calculated for the project as a whole. The Swedish Research Council thus requests that information on the total cost of each project, that is, both direct and indirect costs, is reported in the application for Project Research Grants.

The primary objective of the evaluation panels is to assess the scientific quality of the applications according to the instructions given by the SCCCs. In their scientific assessments, the evaluation panels should not consider different levels of indirect costs. The evaluation panels should assess the
reasonableness of the applicant’s proposed budget in relation to the project’s implementation and can suggest cutbacks in the project’s budget.

10.5 Addressing Open Access in grant applications to the Swedish Research Council
Scientific publications must be assessed independently of publication method. All peer-reviewed conference and journal publications emanating from research funded wholly or in part by the Swedish Research Council must be published with Open Access. In the event of parallel publication in open institutional archives, the document must be submitted upon publication and become openly accessible within six months (twelve months following special permission). Applicants for project funding from the Swedish Research Council may apply for funding to cover any extra costs in conjunction with Open Access publication, in accordance with the conditions given above.

10.6 Conflicts of interest in the evaluation and decision-making process
The conflict-of-interest policy of the Swedish Research Council approved by the Board on 3 April 2001 and later ratified by the Director General on 21 February 2006, are to be followed during the evaluation and decision-making process.

10.7 Gender equality
The gender equality strategy of the Swedish Research Council prescribes men and women should have the same success rate and the same average grant size with regards to the nature of the research and the grant type. Before the evaluation panel makes a recommendation for the allocation of grants, the approval rate in the recommendation and the average grant size should be determined for women and men, respectively. Gender equality should be used as a boundary condition for the prioritization of applications of equal (or near equal) quality. In these cases, applications from underrepresented gender are given higher priority. Before the SCCCs make their decision, the Secretary General presents the recommendations of the evaluation panels for grant approval from an equality perspective and comments on any differences in the approval rate and the average grant size between women and men. When the SCCCs then present the results to the Board, these are to include comments on any differences regarding the aspects stated above and a plan for correcting these differences.

10.8 Special priority areas
For special grants where decisions have been delegated to SCCCs, the respective SCCC is responsible for assuring that these lead to investments in the intended areas and for reporting the results to the Board after deciding on allocations.

10.9 Documentation for reviewing applications
The completed grant application forms, including the attachments, etc specified in the call, serve as the basis for the evaluation panel’s review of a grant application. Letters of recommendation, letters of support or similar documents received by the Swedish Research Council are not part of the application. Hence, they should not be accorded any value in assessing the application.
APPENDIX 4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

What Constitutes a Conflict of Interest?

Policies concerning conflict of interest are addressed in the Administrative Procedure Act (1986:223), a general Act covering all administrative authorities in Sweden.

According to Section 11 of the Act, the policies concerning conflict of interest apply to persons charged with handling a matter. This concept covers not only the individuals that participate in the final decision/action regarding a matter, but also those involved in processing the matter. The determining factor is whether or not the person in question is involved in such a way that he or she could potentially influence the outcome.

The Administrative Procedure Act (1986:223) describes conflicts of interest as:

**Conflicts involving private interest, personal involvement, and family ties**
Persons charged with handling a matter have a conflict of interest:
- If the matter concerns themselves or their spouse, parents, children, siblings, or someone else closely related to them.
- If they or someone closely related to them can expect extraordinary advantage or detriment from the outcome of the matter.

**Conflicts involving legal representation**
Persons charged with handling a matter have a conflict of interest:
- If they, or anyone closely related to them, legally represent someone that the matter concerns or anyone that can expect extraordinary advantage or detriment from the outcome of the matter.

**Conflicts involving organisational roles**
Persons charged with handling a matter have a conflict of interest:
- If the matter has been brought before the authority by an appeal against or the subordination of the decision of another authority, and the person has taken part earlier under the auspices of the subordinate authority in the final handling of a matter concerning the same material issue.
- If the matter has been brought before the authority by reason of the supervision of another authority, and the person has taken part earlier under the auspices of the subordinate authority in the final handling of a matter concerning the same material issue.

**Conflicts involving proxies or agents**
Persons charged with handling a matter have a conflict of interest:
- If they have served someone as a proxy or have assisted that person for payment as regards the material issue.

**Conflicts involving special circumstances**
Persons charged with handling a matter have a conflict of interest:
- If some other special circumstance is likely to undermine confidence in their impartiality in the matter.

Why a Conflict of Interest Policy?

Policies concerning conflict of interest (as with other administrative policies that apply to public authorities) have the following functions:
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• To guide the organisation and implementation of work performed by the authority and to assure objective and impartial handling of matters.
• To engender confidence among the parties concerned and the public that the above takes place.

Conflict of Interest Policy at the Swedish Research Council

Responsibility for adhering to the conflict of interest policy rests partly with the administrative authority itself and partly with the person charged with handling a matter (italics indicate the terminology used in the Act).

The person charged with handling a matter is a concept that includes administrators and officials. Hence, this applies to everyone within the Swedish Research Council organisation, i.e. the governing board, scientific councils, committees, evaluation panels, prioritisation committees, experts, and secretary generals. The work of the Swedish Research Council differs in several respects from the work of other authorities. A key difference is that most members of the decision-making bodies are appointed to represent the community of researchers directly affected by the decisions. This creates a special risk for special circumstances, which are described below in greater detail.

General considerations

• Persons with a conflict of interest may not be charged with handling a matter, i.e. they may not participate in processing a matter or in making decisions concerning the matter.
• Persons who are aware of a situation where they might be perceived to have a conflict of interest shall voluntarily disclose this.
• If a question involving conflict of interest arises concerning someone, and if no replacement has been appointed, the Swedish Research Council shall quickly resolve the issue. Persons suspected of having a conflict of interest may participate in evaluating the issue only if the issue cannot be resolved without their participation, and if someone else cannot be called in without excessive delay.
• A decision on a conflict of interest may be appealed only in conjunction with an appeal of the authority’s decision in the matter.

Conflicts involving special circumstances

This category covers the situations not covered by any other grounds for a conflict of interest. However, it should not be used routinely as soon as other grounds for conflict of interest do not formally apply. Substantial reasons are required for its application.

Examples of conflicts involving special circumstances might include:

• close collaboration in a professional context
• obvious friendship or hostility
• dependent relationship of an economic nature
• supervisor–subordinate relationship
• someone engaged in the matter in a way that suspicion can easily arise that the conditions for impartial judgement are inadequate.

The individual situation must be assessed based on the nature and scope of the relationships and the time involved.

The following situations may carry a particularly high risk for conflict of interest and/or may be perceived to jeopardize confidence:

• When the person charged with handling a matter is affiliated with the same institution (particularly if small or mid-sized) or other independent economic entity as the applicant.
• When the person charged with handling a matter is potentially dependent on the applicant in another context. An example would be if the applicant were responsible for evaluating the qualifications, grant application, institution, or topic of the person charged with handling the matter.
• When the person charged with handling a matter has an ongoing, or recently concluded, close relationship with the applicant, e.g. a teacher-student relationship or joint research project.
In some cases, joint authorship of books or articles may present a sensitive situation. The determining factor is whether or not there has been close collaboration in a professional sense. Since publication practices vary widely among different fields it is not possible to establish common guidelines that would apply to the entire Swedish Research Council.

Among persons charged with handling a matter, those at greatest risk for a conflict of interest would be those who are active in science, mainly the members of the Governing Board, scientific councils, evaluation panels, and prioritisation committees, but even experts and secretary generals. Research grant applications from members of the Governing Board, the scientific councils, committees, evaluation panels, and prioritisation committees may not be processed in the group where the member holds a position as chair, member, or observer. Special rules on research funding apply to secretary generals.

Preventing conflicts of interest

The Swedish Research Council uses the following guidelines to prevent a conflict of interest:

- At an early stage, lists of applicants should be sent to persons charged with handling matters in the relevant scientific councils, committees, evaluation panels, and prioritisation committees. The members should be instructed to disclose any conflict of interest, or potential risk for a conflict of interest, related to any of the applications.
- The members should be asked to disclose any other risks, beyond the ones listed in this document, for conflict of interest.
- When the evaluation panels and prioritisation committees are appointed and the applications are distributed, the conflict of interest issue should be addressed and conflict of interest situations avoided. This can be done, e.g. by appointing the evaluation panels and prioritisation groups after the applications have been received, or by re-assigning an application to a different group.
- Persons charged with handling a matter shall not be assigned to report on an application when there is a risk for conflict of interest.
- Persons charged with handling a matter shall not be present when an application is processed in a working group or prioritisation committee if there is a risk for conflict of interest.
- When an application is processed as a part of a batch (e.g. when a scientific council concurrently decides on several applications based on a prioritisation list from a working group) the only persons prevented from participating are persons charged with handling a matter who have a conflict of interest in a legal sense.

Procedural rules pertaining to conflict of interest

The guidelines above cannot always prevent conflict of interest situations from arising.

The most common cases are the following:

- A member of the Council applies for funding or employment.
- An application involves a highly specialised area where it is not possible to find members in the evaluation panels or prioritisation committees who do not have a particular connection with the applicant.

In these and other cases where a conflict of interest might exist, a written statement shall be submitted from at least two external experts.

When a conflict of interest exists, the following measures shall be taken in handling a matter.

- The person with a conflict of interest shall leave the room.
- The conflict of interest shall be recorded in the minutes.
- The minutes shall also record cases where conflict of interest was assessed, but found not to exist.
- Minutes shall be taken regarding the conflict of interest, even if minutes of the meeting are not taken.

Decisions that do not apply directly to individuals

At times, situations arise that do not apply to any particular applicant, but where the person charged with handling a matter might, nevertheless, have a personal interest. This could include, e.g. establishing special
research programmes, prioritising particular research areas, granting funds to infrastructure projects, and designing targeted funding of various types.

In such cases, the greatest assurance for impartiality would be peer review and maximum transparency in documentation of the evidence upon which the decision is based.

Hence, anyone charged with handling a matter in such a context should endeavour to be impartial and, to the greatest extent possible, document the basis for his or her decisions. Anyone participating in a decision should thoroughly review the facts even if they do not report on, or are specialised in, the subject area.

Confidence issues
Confidence among the parties involved and the public in an authority’s ability to act impartially depends not only on its adherence to conflict of interest policies, but also on its adherence to other principles associated with these policies. Two such principles concern transparency and documentation.

Transparency
Transparency is addressed in the Administrative Procedure Act: “An applicant, appellant, or other party is entitled to have access to the material that has been brought into the matter, provided that the matter concerns the exercise of public authority in relation to someone.” This statute goes beyond the general principle of public access to information. Persons charged with handling matters at the Swedish Research Council should, whenever possible, assure a similar level of transparency even if the matter does not involve “the exercise of public authority in relation to someone”.

Documentation
The Swedish Research Council shall document the information used in decision-making. If the matter concerns “the exercise of public authority in relation to someone” the documentation must include the reasons for a decision. However, the reasons may be excluded if the decision concerns, e.g. a job appointment, admission to optional education, determination of grades, and allocation of research grants. If the reasons are excluded, the authority should provide them on request.

This policy is intended to protect the individual against disclosure of unfavourable information. If this interest is not jeopardised, the documented reasons for a decision should be reported.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person charged with handling a matter</td>
<td>Anyone who can influence the outcome of a matter during the processing phase (e.g. research project managers) and the decision-making phase (e.g. Council members).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling</td>
<td>All action taken by an authority on a matter, from start to finish (including decision-making and any re-evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>In a context of a legislative Act, the expression “handling a matter” usually refers to an administrative authority’s decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise of public authority in relation to someone</td>
<td>Decisions rendered in accordance with Acts or regulations that concern the rights and responsibilities of the individual. In the context of the Swedish Research Council, typical examples would be the decisions rendered on matters involving research grants and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>Conflict of interest refers to a situation which undermines confidence that a particular official or administrator will act impartially in handling a matter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conflicts of private interest, personal involvement, and family ties**
The focus here is on private interests. The latter two situations are sufficiently self-explanatory. Conflicts of private interest are said to exist if the person charged with handling a matter can expect extraordinary advantage or detriment from the outcome of the matter. This does not refer to the legal interest (compare personal involvement) but to the actual interest of the person. Extraordinary advantage is not the same as special advantage, but something substantially greater is required for this situation to exist. A classic case would be if the person charged with handling a matter owns shares in a corporation involved in the matter. The decisive factors would be the amount of holdings and the importance of the matter to the corporation.

**Conflicts of legal representation**
In this context, legal representative refers mainly to persons authorized to sign for a company, an association, or any other legal entity, or those who are guardians, executors, or trustees for other physical persons, e.g. minors. The conditions are generally similar to those described above in section 1.

**Conflicts of organisational roles**
The person charged with handling a matter at a higher level of authority has already dealt with the matter at a lower level to the extent that his or her objectivity can be called into question. This assumes that the matter has arisen either through an appeal process or because of supervisory responsibilities. This also assumes that the person charged with handling a matter at the higher level had participated in final handling of the matter in question at the lower level. Usually, it does not include cases where someone within one and the same administrative authority participates in different phases of handling a matter.
APPENDIX 5. ETHICS PRINCIPLES: APPROVALS, AND GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE

The administrative entity\(^1\) has the responsibility to ensure that the research project complies with the terms and conditions established by Swedish law.

The applicant (project leader) has the responsibility to acquire all necessary approvals for the research that receives a grant from the Swedish Research Council.

- Research involving animal experiments requires approval from the Ethical Committee on Animal Experiments, in accordance with the Swedish Animal Welfare Act (1988:534).
- Research concerning humans and biological material from humans, and which falls under the Act on Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans (2003:460), requires review and approval from an ethical review board.
- Some research may require additional approvals e.g. research involving pharmaceuticals, genetically modified organisms, and ionizing radiation.

The Swedish Research Council assumes that the necessary permits and approvals have been obtained for the research covered by a grant application to the Swedish Research Council.

- Approvals should NOT be sent to the Swedish Research Council.
- For projects awarded funding from the Swedish Research Council, the project leader and the representative of the administrative entity must confirm, when they accept the terms and conditions of the funding decision, that they take responsibility for acquiring necessary approvals.

The Swedish Research Council assumes that research conducted with funding from the Swedish Research Council adheres to good research practice.

- In the grant application, the applicant must present the ethical issues associated with the research and describe how they will be addressed during the research project.

---

\(^1\) Administrative entity: A state agency or physical or legal person within whose organisation the research is conducted. Universities or higher education institutions often serve as the administrative entity for research conducted with funding from the Swedish Research Council.
APPENDIX 6. STRATEGY FOR GENDER EQUALITY AT THE SWEDISH RESEARCH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Board of the Swedish Research Council Nr 4, 2013
Appendix 1

Strategy for Gender Equality at the Swedish Research Council

Decision 2013-06-13

Goals for Achieving Gender Equality at the Swedish Research Council

In compliance with the Instructions Ordinance, the Swedish Research Council promotes gender equality throughout its sphere of activities. The strategy for achieving this aim is to strive for gender equality throughout the organisation. Hence, the Swedish Research Council has established the following operational goals:

1) achieve and maintain an equal gender distribution in its evaluation panels,
2) ensure that the percentages of female and male applicants for grants from the Swedish Research Council correspond to the percentages of women and men among the potential research grant applicants,
3) ensure that women and men have the same success rates and receive the same average size of grants, taking into account the nature of the research and the type of grant.

The Board has the responsibility for implementation of the Swedish Research Council’s strategy. Achieving the goals requires the involvement of the entire agency, including the Scientific Councils and the other councils and committees (SCCCs). Unless otherwise specified, the Director General is responsible for advancing the efforts towards achieving equality.

Introduction

This strategy applies to the Swedish Research Council as a research-funding organisation. A special equal opportunities plan addresses the work of achieving equality within the Swedish Research Council as a public agency.

The primary objective of the Swedish Research Council is to allocate funding to research of the highest scientific quality and that best promotes innovation. Achieving this objective requires impartial assessment of grant applications. Impartial assessment implies gender neutrality; that the Swedish Research Council supports the best researchers, regardless of gender.

The Swedish Research Council assumes that research capacity exists to the same extent in both sexes. Moreover, the Swedish Research Council assumes that research is benefited when both genders participate and apply their expertise and experience.

Gender equality is also a matter of justice. Women and men should have equal opportunities to conduct research and develop professional careers as researchers.

---

2 Success rates for women and men refer to the percentage of applications approved among total applications received from women and men respectively.

3 Attainment of the goal must be assessed in the context of a sufficiently large number of decisions.

4 These include the Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences, the Scientific Council for Medicine and Health, the Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences, the Council for Research Infrastructures, the Educational Sciences Committee, the Committee for Artistic Research and Development and the Committee for Development Research.
Achieving gender equality throughout the Swedish Research Council’s spheres of activity requires a persistent, long-term effort and continuous attention to assure that the ground gained towards equality is not lost. The agency must continually monitor and analyse its activities from an equality perspective and take necessary steps based on the results. The Swedish Research Council should also inform others about its actions in gender equality.

Moreover, the Swedish Research Council must consider how the results of gender research might contribute towards improving equality throughout the agency’s sphere of activity.

Laws, Ordinances, and Appropriation Directions
Equality between women and men is addressed by a body of laws and regulations, e.g. the Instrument of Government Chapter 1 Section 2 (part of the Constitution), the Discrimination Act (2008:467), the Higher Education Act (1992:1434), and the Higher Education Ordinance (1993:100).

According to the Swedish Research Council Instructions Ordinance (2009:975) Chapter 1 Section 14, the Swedish Research Council must promote equality between women and men within its sphere of activity. In accordance with the requirements established by the Government in the Appropriation Directions, the goals achieved must be presented in the Annual Report of the Swedish Research Council.

Processes for Achieving Goals
The Swedish Research Council must analyse its activities from a perspective of gender equality and follow up on the extent to which the goals have been achieved. This should be done annually in conjunction with the presentation to the Board regarding the outcome of the year’s general call and in conjunction with producing the Annual Report. Equality issues must be discussed by the Board and by other parts of the organisation, and necessary actions must be taken. Furthermore, a comprehensive analysis of gender equality must be conducted at the end of the Board’s 3-year term of office. When a new Board takes office it must review the gender equality strategy and where necessary decide on changes to the strategy.

The following points describe how the operational goals should be achieved.

1. Equal gender distribution in Swedish Research Council evaluation panels

“The Swedish Research Council should achieve and maintain an equal gender distribution in its evaluation panels.” (Goal 1)

In this context, equal gender distribution is considered to exist in a group when neither of the sexes comprises less than 40% of the panel members.

Gender distribution should be considered before appointing the evaluation panels. Work involving equality should take a long-term perspective. This means, e.g. that in certain areas where men are greatly underrepresented among teachers and researchers at higher education institutions, the Swedish Research Council must be observant not to over-utilise those few men. The same applies in instances where women are greatly underrepresented.

If the proposed composition of an evaluation panel falls outside of the 40% to 60% range, this must be specified in the decision-making material prepared for the Secretary General concerned. This material must also include justification for the deviation and describe the actions taken to achieve an equal gender distribution.

Gender equality aspects should also be considered when appointing participants to other groups and when making decisions concerning Swedish Research Council representation on external (national and international) bodies.
2. Grant applications by women and men

“The Swedish Research Council should ensure that the percentages of female and male applicants for grants from the Swedish Research Council correspond to the percentages of women and men among the potential research grant applicants.” (Goal 2)

Currently, women and men are applying for research grants from the Swedish Research Council at rates corresponding to their proportion in the potential pool of research grant applicants. Should this situation change in the future, the Swedish Research Council would actively recruit more applications from the underrepresented gender.

3. Same success rates for women and men

“The Swedish Research Council should ensure that women and men have the same success rates5 and receive the same average size of grants, taking into account the nature of the research and the type of grant.”6 (Goal 3)

Before the Swedish Research Council decides to introduce a new type of grant or makes a new research investment the effects on gender equality must be analysed and consideration given to whether any special measures are necessary. The analysis should address gender equality at the total level and also be according to the different types of grants and subject areas.

The task of the Swedish Research Council to promote gender equality throughout its sphere of activities, as well as gender equality as a factor for raising quality should be emphasized in the text of the calls, the evaluation criteria and types of evaluations should be considered from an equality perspective.

Members of the Scientific Councils and the other councils and committees and the members of evaluation panels must be informed about the gender equality strategy of the Swedish Research Council. The evaluation panels shall be instructed in gender equality issues during the information meetings prior to the evaluation work. Other experts involved must also be informed of the strategy (available in Swedish and English).

The Swedish Research Council’s evaluation handbooks must include written instructions for the evaluation panels, giving attention to the following:

- that all evaluation criteria must be clear and explicit. When the call is issued, the criteria and the instructions for applicants must be published on the Swedish Research Council’s website,
- that only “active research years” should be considered in evaluating the extent of scientific productivity, i.e. time off for parental leave, sick leave, or similar circumstances should be deducted,

Prior to each new round of evaluations, the assistant research secretaries of the Swedish Research Council must discuss the above instructions with the evaluations panels. Before an evaluation panel submits its proposal for allocating research grants, it must calculate the proposed success rates and average size of grants for women and men, respectively.

The secretaries general must present the evaluation panels’ grant allocation proposals, from an equality perspective, to the respective Scientific Councils and the other councils and committees (SCCCs), commenting on possible gender disparities in success rates and average size of grants. These presentations must be delivered before the SCCCs make their decisions. The respective SCCCs must attach to their decision a collective assessment of the results in relation to the Swedish Research Council’s gender equality strategy. These assessments should include comments by the SCCCs concerning possible disparities, as mentioned above, and a plan/strategy to rectify them. A written consensus opinion from each of the SCCCs must be forwarded to the Board.

5 See footnote 2.
6 See footnote 3.
In conjunction with the Director General’s and the SCCCs’ presentation to the Board regarding the outcome of the annual calls for proposals, the success rates for women and men must be presented for each of the SCCCs and each type of grant. The average size of the grants must also be reported by gender. A summary of the results shall be included in the Annual Report of the Swedish Research Council. Presentations by the SCCCs to the Board must include comments on possible disparities, as regards the matters mentioned above, and a plan to rectify any disparities.
APPENDIX 7. TRAVEL ROUTINES AND POLICY FOR THE SWEDISH RESEARCH COUNCIL

Plan ahead for your travelling in order to make it as time and cost effective as possible!

Appointed travel suppliers

You as a traveller determine your own itinerary. Every portion of a trip, such as the tickets, car rental, and other travel arrangements, must be booked with one of the following travel suppliers, appointed by the Swedish Research Council:

**American Express Business Travel**
Phone +46 243-21 30 50
Fax +46 243-21 30 60
E-mail: businessstravel.se@service.americanexpress.com

State customer: Swedish Research Council / Vetenskapsrådet
State customer number: 1612002115
State reference code and reference person: **This information is provided by the administrator for your review panel.**

When you book travel using this information, the invoice will be sent directly to the Swedish Research Council.

**SJ**
Phone: +46 (0) 771-75 75 55, press 1

State customer: Swedish Research Council / Vetenskapsrådet
State customer number: 937608
State reference code and reference person: **The information is provided by the administrator for your review panel.**

When you order using this information, the invoice will be sent directly to the Swedish Research Council. When you order directly at www.sj.se, you will pay for the travel and later claim the cost using the reimbursement form (see the section “Reimbursement for Travel Expenses,” below).

Mode and means of transport

You are responsible for choosing the most suitable mode of transport, taking into account the cost and time involved, as well as safety and environmental considerations.

Travel by plane and train
Air and train journeys should normally be reserved in economy class or the equivalent. Trips of up to 500 kilometres are preferably to be booked by train, if time allows. Contact the travel supplier for a consultation well before your departure.
**Travel by private car**
You may use your own car if this is the least expensive mode of travel. You will be refunded for the number of kilometres driven in the course of your official duties. Tax-free compensation for the distance driven is currently SEK 1.85 per kilometre.

**Travel to and from the airport**
Journeys to and from airports often make up a large proportion of travel costs. Travelling by taxi is generally expensive, but by planning the journey to and from the airport can considerably reduce costs. The airport bus or airport train should be the primary choice. An airport taxi may be used if you are travelling with heavy luggage. Taxi journeys to and from airports should always be booked at a shared rate to reduce costs.

**Hotel stays**
Accommodation in connection with the evaluation-panel meetings is arranged by the Swedish Research Council according to the information you provide the administrator of your review panel. Should you need additional accommodation before or after the meeting, you must provide this information when you make your reservation.

**Reimbursement for travel expenses**
A form for reimbursement of expenses related to your travel can be found on our web page (http://www.vr.se/forskningsfinansiering/blanketter) and should always be used for claiming reimbursements from the Swedish Research Council.

The form, which **must be signed by you, the traveller**, must contain all the particulars needed in order to arrange for reimbursement of expenses: **original receipts**, vouchers, and train and air tickets (e-tickets) should be enclosed. Amounts in foreign currency should be recalculated according to the exchange rate at the time of transaction. Send the reimbursement form to the administrator of your review panel. The costs for which you are entitled to reimbursement according to the Swedish Research Council’s reimbursement rules will be paid out to you.

**Expenses for food and beverages are not reimbursed.**
A reimbursement form related to a particular month should be sent in before the end of the following month. **The traveller’s entitlement to reimbursement expires if the travel claim is not submitted within one year of the month in which the trip took place.**
APPENDIX 8. EVALUATION PANELS RFI

Duties for chairs of evaluation panels and research officers

The Council for Research Infrastructures (RFI) appoints the evaluation panels. At least one RFI member should be included in the evaluation panel, usually as vice chair. A research officer from the Research Council acts as a secretary to the group. The chair, vice chair and the research officer jointly represent the Research Council’s and RFI’s policies during the evaluation process. The chair plans and conducts the evaluation meeting and is assisted by the research officer. The vice chair takes over when the chair reports a conflict of interest, either for an individual application or for the whole process if the chair has an application that is evaluated by the group. The research officer assists the chair in planning, assumes responsibility for administrative management in the review process and assists the meeting by providing expert knowledge regarding handling procedure, rules, practice, etc.

Evaluation panels

1 Infrastructure for astronomy and subatomic research

Chair: Göran Östlin*, SU
Vice chair: Barbro Åsman, SU
Research officer: Catarina Sahlberg, VR

Members:
Susanne Aalto, Chalmers
Marta-Lena Antti, Luleå tekniska universitet
Thomas Jonsson, KTH
Per Magnusson, Rymdstyrelsen
Thomas Nilsson, Chalmers
Julia Tjus, Universität Bochum

2 Infrastructure for molecular, cell, and material research

Chair: Maria Anvret, GU
Vice chair: Kajsa Uvdal, LiU
Research officer: Tove Andersson, VR

Members:
Stefan Hohmann, GU
Anders Malmström, LU
Aleksandar Matic, Chalmers
Tor Ny, UmU
Ingmar Persson, SLU
Lena Svendson, Vinnova
Marie Vennström, Sandvik
Xiaodong Zou, SU
3 Infrastructure for research on the earth and its near surroundings

Chair: Roland Roberts, UU
Vice chair: Hjalmar Laudon, SLU Umeå
Research officer: Mats Andersson, VR

Members:
Sofie Björling, Formas
Tim Fristedt, FOI
Jörg Gumbel, SU
Annakaisa Korja, University of Helsinki
Helene Lundkvist, SLU Uppsala
Marcus Ohman, LTU

4 Infrastructure for e-science

Chair: Pär Strand, Chalmers
Vice chair: Ingela Nyström, UU
Research officer: Anna Wetterbom, VR

Members:
Mats Holmström, IRF
Ebba Þóra Hvannberg, University of Iceland
Milena Ivanova, Netherlands eScience Center
Fredrik Ronquist, NRM
Ellen Sherwood, KI/Scilife
Roar Skålin, Research Council of Norway

5 Infrastructure for man, culture, and society

Chair: Joakim Palme, UU
Vice chair: Nancy Pedersen, KI
Research officer: Susanna Bylin, VR

Members:
Peter Allebeck, Forte/KI
Gunnar Andersson, SU
Susanna Hedenborg*, MaH
Erland Hjelmqvist, GU
Margareta Kristenson, LiU
Bente Meagard, University of Copenhagen

* Does not participate in the handling of applications 2014 due to own application or other conflict of interest.
APPENDIX 9. GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION PANELS

RFI determines the composition of the evaluation panels (*beredningsgrupper*). The panel chairs suggest members for their panels after consulting the vice chair and the research officer (*forskningssekreterare*).

The following rules apply to the composition of evaluation panels:

1) The evaluation panels should have a minimum of five members and a maximum of eight members, including the chair and vice chair.

2) The vice chair should, if possible, be a member of RFI.

3) The term of office for the evaluation panel members is three years, and may be extended to a maximum of six years.

4) The evaluation panels’ composition must be broad, both in terms of subject areas and geography. The members of the panels should be familiar with infrastructure issues in a broad sense, and in their line of duty they must take responsibility for the entire group’s remit and not be an advocate for their particular area of expertise.

5) It is desirable that a number of foreign researchers are appointed members to the panels.

6) The panel chairs must try to achieve an equitable gender distribution (40-60% of each gender) within the panel. If this proves impossible, the chair must explain why (in writing to RFI) and specify those of the underrepresented gender who were invited to join the panel but declined.

7) Vice chancellors (rektorer), deans (dekaner) or heads of large departments (storinstitutionsprefekter) must not be appointed members of evaluation panels.

8) Evaluation panel members (including the chair) may not have submitted an application (or participated in one) that needs to be processed by the evaluation panel. In such cases, either these panel members (including the chair) must refrain from the review work for the current year, or their applications must be processed by another evaluation panel.

9) Panel members must report any conflict of interest to existing research infrastructures and new or proposed ones that are addressed by the group. The research officer shall establish a list and maintain a record of all members’ interests in existing and planned infrastructures on the list. This list must also document conflicts of interest concerning external reviewers (externa granskare) or experts consulted by the group.
APPENDIX 10. TYPES OF GRANTS, RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURES, RFI

Calls for applications within RFI:

- Infrastructure – Planning grant
- Infrastructure – Operation grant (prolonged grant for national infrastructure)
- Infrastructure – Operation grant (participation in international research infrastructure)
- Infrastructure – Grant for expensive scientific equipment (participation in international research infrastructure)

The calls for applications can after the deadline be found at vr.se > Research funding > Apply for grants > Call for proposals > Closed call for proposals – archive