

Guidelines

for the Review of Proposals under the Federal States' Major Instrumentation Programme



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



I. Programme information

The DFG reviews major instrumentation proposals submitted by universities and university hospitals on behalf of the federal states that are fully financed by the states concerned. The DFG's review of the proposals ensures that the planned investment projects are founded on science-led quality assurance.

Applications under the Federal States' Major Instrumentation Programme can be justified to an equal extent based on planned use for the purpose of research, training and teaching, and clinical care, whether directly or indirectly. (See DFG form 21.2 – Guidelines for Proposals under the State Major Instrumentation with Proposal Preparation Instructions).

www.dfg.de/formulare/21_02

The DFG Head Office prepares a decision proposal based on the reviews obtained. Subsequently, all documents are sent to the members of the Scientific Instrumentation and Information Technology Committee. The latter is a body elected by the DFG's Joint Committee: it is responsible for ensuring the quality of the review process and arrives at a funding recommendation on behalf of the Joint Committee, taking into account other aspects or fundamental considerations as appropriate.

Please note:

- Please consider first whether you possess the specialist expertise required.
If you do not feel professionally competent, please let us know as soon as possible. In this case, we would be grateful if you help us by naming individuals who might be qualified to take on the role of a reviewer.
- General Guidelines for Reviews (DFG form 10.20) are available at:
www.dfg.de/formulare/10_20
- If you have any questions regarding the proposal, please direct them solely to the DFG Head Office.
- If necessary, the Head Office will ensure that any points in need of clarification arising from your review are forwarded to the applicants and will ask you to submit your final review after a response to these questions has been obtained.

- Please limit your review to a maximum of two pages.

II. Structure of the Review

1. Use and capacity utilisation of the requested instrumentation

Is the procurement necessary regarding the instrumentation already available at the site and the utilisation concepts proposed (e.g. core facilities)?

- Consideration of the possible uses of existing instrumentation
- Appropriateness of the number of people and working groups that will make use of the instrumentation
- Are the utilisation concepts (e.g. in connection with core facilities) convincing?
- Should the instrumentation be made accessible to other individuals or working groups?

2. Operational expertise and infrastructural environment

Are the necessary personnel and technical requirements met so as to ensure effective and productive use of the instrumentation?

- Do the people involved have (sufficient) prior experience of this class of instrumentation?
- Are sufficient (trained) staff available – also in the long term?
- Is there an infrastructure in place for preparatory work or follow-up work/evaluations (e.g. data analysis and management)?
- Have specific requirements for the installation site been sufficiently taken into account (e.g. cleanroom or air conditioning)?
- If the instrumentation is to be used directly for research projects: how do you rate the explanations on the handling of research data?

3.1 Justification of necessity for a scientific project (only if use for research is planned)

Do the researchers' scientific activities and proposed projects justify procurement?

- Soundness of the preparatory work
- Quality of publications and scientific results achieved to date (please note that if the proposal contains several sections in the Research chapter (3.1, 3.2, etc), the

[Guidelines for Preparing Publication Lists](#) apply regarding the proposal-related bibliography (per section)

- Scientific significance of the planned projects

3.2 Justification of necessity for training and teaching (only if use for training and teaching is planned)

Does the planned use in training and teaching justify procurement?

- Sufficient information on numbers and types of courses, lecturers
- Sufficient justification of the educational need for the procurement of the instrumentation requested, including its configuration and performance class

3.3 Justification of necessity for clinical care (only if use for clinical care is planned)

Do the clinical care requirements justify procurement of the instrumentation requested?

- Well-founded justification for procurement of the instrumentation requested, including its configuration and performance class, with regard to the intended testing or treatment programmes
- Sufficient information regarding the number and type of tests or treatments to be carried out using the instrumentation and the medical staff to be assigned to it

3.4 Necessity of the central project or IT system requested for the intended purposes (only for IT systems or central projects)

Is the requested central project or the IT system effective and necessary to fulfil the intended purposes?

- Does the proposal provide sufficient information on the existing and planned central implementation concept (e.g. IT concept)?
- How is the integration into the overall strategy of the applicant institution to be assessed (e.g. overall IT concept)?
- Has care been taken to ensure that the resources required over and above the investment applied for are available (i.e. full-cost calculation)?

4. Choice of vendor and instrumentation, configuration and costs

Is the selected product appropriate, including configuration and cost? Have the follow-up costs been realistically calculated?

- Necessity of the requested instrumentation and performance class
- Necessity of the requested accessories
- Sufficient market research
- Calculation of running costs and other follow-up costs (e.g. repair, personnel)

5. Recommendation

Please provide a **clear recommendation** as to whether the proposal should be approved. Take into account whether the choice of the instrumentation including all accessories is appropriate and whether this is matched by the funds requested. If you are essentially in favour of funding but it seems appropriate to you to suggest a reduction in the amount, please do so in concrete terms.