



## **EVALUATION GUIDE**

**STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT,  
INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT CALL (CEEC IND)  
5th EDITION**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P.* (FCT), the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, is the public agency that supports Science and Technology in all areas of knowledge. FCT promotes research talent through sustainable advanced training and consolidation of scientific careers, supports Research Units, fosters international competitiveness and visibility of research and innovation carried out in Portugal, facilitates access to state-of-the-art Research Infrastructures, and encourages knowledge transfer.

FCT funds people (by awarding doctoral scholarships and scientific employment contracts), ideas (through R&D project grants), Research Units, Associate Laboratories, Collaborative Laboratories and Infrastructures, as well as International Cooperation.

The aim of this call is to **fund scientific employment contracts** for PhD holders based on competitive procedures with an external international peer review process of the applications submitted online. The call entails a [public announcement](#) (in Portuguese) outlining the required features for application, the evaluation criteria and the number of contracts to be funded.

The present call will be open between **February 3 and March 3, 2022**.

This document outlines the evaluation process and the procedures adopted for the 5th edition of the yearly call for the Stimulus of Scientific Employment – Individual Support (CEEC IND), announced by FCT on December 27, 2021.

**All applications will be evaluated by a panel of international experts covering the scientific areas and subareas chosen by the applicants**

## 2. STIMULUS OF SCIENTIFIC EMPLOYMENT – INDIVIDUAL SUPPORT

Strengthening scientific employment in Portugal is central to the Portuguese science-based strategy for growth, by which specific financial support is given to the institutions for hiring new researchers and thereby contributing to rejuvenation of scientific and academic institutions.

For this purpose, FCT issued the [Regulation of Scientific Employment](#) (REC) in 2017, updated on December 2019, with two instruments to promote scientific employment:

- An **Individual Support** for hiring PhD holders by R&D Portuguese institutions. Applicants submit an **individual** application to a yearly call launched by FCT (CEEC IND);
- An Institutional Support for development of scientific employment by PhD holders in R&D Portuguese institutions (CEEC INST). Institutions apply with a scientific employment plan with positions to be funded. It is their responsibility to select researchers to be hired.

The present call is aimed at providing **individual support for hiring 400 researchers holding a PhD degree in any scientific area**. The profile of the applicants should correspond to highly motivated scientists seeking to carry out research in Portuguese Institutions. Research contracts will be awarded for a maximum of 6 years

of funding which is solely intended for salary and its associated costs for the employer. No other expenses are eligible.

Host Institutions eligible for this call are R&D Research Units funded by FCT, Associate Laboratories or State Laboratories.

For host institutions without legal personality, the institution with legal personality in which they are integrated will be the legal representative and the contracting institution.

Four types of contracts can be funded under this call, corresponding to different career stages<sup>1</sup>:

- a) **Junior researcher:** PhD holders for 5 or less years<sup>2</sup>, with limited post-doctoral research experience in the scientific area of the application.
- b) **Assistant researcher:** PhD holders for over 5 years and less than 12 years<sup>3</sup> (inclusive) with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application and with limited scientific independence.
- c) **Principal researcher:** PhD holders for over 12 years<sup>4</sup> with relevant *curriculum* in the scientific area of the application, demonstrating some scientific independence for the last 3 years.
- d) **Coordinating researcher:** PhD holders of a title of *habilitado* or *agregado* in Portugal, obtained until the closing of the call, with a *curriculum* of high merit, and demonstrating scientific independence and leadership in the scientific area of the application.

**Research independence** is demonstrated through scientific competence, originality, and international recognition, by experience in doctoral or post-doctoral supervision, or by the competitive research funds attracted at national and/or international level.

**Scientific leadership** is demonstrated through innovative research and technological development of recognised merit and quality, contribution to the advancement of knowledge or its application, and through the acknowledgement of her/his role as a national or international reference in her/his scientific area. Examples of scientific leadership include the coordination of Research groups or Centres, of international Research Projects, or the delivery of plenary talks in international conferences or other relevant events.

- Each applicant can only submit one application
- Applicants are responsible for choosing the research contract level to which they are applying, as well as the most suitable scientific area and subarea related to their research plan
- Applicants providing false declarations or committing plagiarism will be excluded from the call

<sup>1</sup> According to the terms of this call, career interruptions due to parental leave or serious illness may be considered in applications to Junior and Assistant research levels when counting the years after having obtained a PhD degree.

<sup>2</sup> Note that to apply to the Junior level your PhD must have been concluded between 4/3/2017 and 3/3/2022, except if you had interruptions in your scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness.

<sup>3</sup> Note that to apply to the Assistant level your PhD must have been concluded between 4/3/2010 and 3/3/2017, except if you had interruptions in your scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness.

<sup>4</sup> Note that to apply to the Principal level your PhD must have been concluded up to 3/3/2010.

### 3. COMPONENTS OF THE APPLICATION RELEVANT FOR EVALUATION

The application comprises the following evaluation components:

- a) **General description**, which includes research contract level, title of the research plan, abstract, 5 keywords for the scientific content of the proposed research plan, scientific area, and evaluation panel.
- b) **Motivation letter and career development plan**, where applicants identify up to two main contributions in the last 5 years and the expected future goals, such as career objectives, how the research plan relates to their career (past and future) and how they intend to develop and consolidate an independent career. They should also describe their plans to establish networking and international collaborations and how they relate to the application.
- c) **CV Synopsis** comprising a synopsis of the scientific and curricular path, major activities and results, and the top five scientific achievements, focused on the last 5 years, taking into account the research contract level of the application.
  - **Synopsis of the scientific and curricular path**, where applicants highlight their main activities and results, such as scientific productivity; abilities and skills to adequately execute the research plan; international experience (*e.g.*, international collaborations and participation in international scientific networks); actions to obtain funding *e.g.*, individual and projects grant applications. Interruptions in scientific activity due to parental leave, serious illness, and other unconventional path or gaps, and how they have impacted activity, may be given in this section.
  - **Major activities and results**, with description of the main activities and achievements and applicant's role and contribution to the advancement of knowledge, such as scientific, technological, cultural, or artistic achievements, and their innovative and creative nature; competitive funding from national and international funding agencies (identifying the main funder and the amount); patents; books, chapters in books, performances and exhibitions (to the extent that they embody research); publications in journals; prizes, honours and awards; supervision and teaching activity; other activities, such as management of science, technology and innovation programmes or projects, outreach activities and dissemination of knowledge, namely for promotion of culture and scientific practices.
  - **Top five scientific achievements**, including the applicant's role in each one. For example, publications in peer-review journals; equivalent contributions/indicators from areas where international peer-review publications are not available or not common practice, such as peer-reviewed conference proceedings, monographs in specific research fields, edited volumes, cultural or artistic performances.
- d) **Research Plan**, which should be **designed for 6 years** (contract lifespan) and should include:
  - **Background**, with an overview of the research field, references to applicant's previous work, state of the art, and explanation of the innovative nature of the research plan
  - **Research plan and methods**, with the identification of the major scientific questions and objectives, a methodological approach to reach the goals and the expected results. It

may contain a chronological work programme with tasks and a time plan, and a risk and contingency plan, if applicable.

- **Expected outcomes**, with reference to the expected outcomes and how they will impact on the applicant's career development, their contribution to the scientific strategy of the host institution, as well as to society and economy, if applicable. Activities of scientific dissemination can also be included.
  - **Ethical issues**, with identification of possible ethical issues related to the activities and results and explanation of how they will be addressed, if applicable.
  - Identification and compliance with up to two [United Nations Sustainable Development Goals \(2030 Agenda\)](#) .
  - References cited within the application.
- e) **Host Institution**, identification and description of the available conditions (expertise and resources) to support the development of the proposed research plan and explanation on how the research plan, the expected results and applicant's motivations fit into the overall research strategy and mission of the host institution.

The above-mentioned sections have a limited number of characters and **only plain text is allowed. Any link or other form of presenting information should be disregarded.** Please see Appendix I for details on application sections and respective characters number.

Applicants are responsible for identifying the host institution. The host institution must submit an agreement document (mandatory) to support the proposed scientific research plan. The host institution must commit itself in providing all resources, including material, support services, critical mass and institutional policy to ensure implementation and development of the research plan.

The applicants are also responsible for identifying the main and secondary scientific areas and corresponding subarea from the list provided ([OECD's revised Field of Science and Technology - FOS](#), adapted to the call). **The main and secondary scientific areas, corresponding subareas and evaluation panels** are listed in Appendix II.

## 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of the application will focus on the relevance, quality, and up-to-datedness of the following criteria:

**A. Merit of the Candidate (60%)**

**B. Merit of the Research Plan (40%)**

## CRITERION A

The assessment of the **Merit of the Candidate** is based on the analysis of the **CV Synopsis** and of the **Motivation letter and career development plan**. Although considering the whole scientific and curricular path of the applicant, **the evaluation should be focused on the last 5 years**, with the following exceptions:

- Junior researchers with less than 5 years of scientific activity.
- Researchers who have interrupted their scientific activity due to maternity/paternity leave and/or serious illness during the last 5 years. In these cases, the 5-year period may be extended.

The evaluation must consider the research career level the applicant is applying for, particularly in what concerns the evaluation of scientific independence (for principal and coordinating researchers) and scientific leadership (for coordinating researchers), and should take into account the following:

- Scientific productivity (scientific, technological, cultural, artistic achievements)
- Abilities and skills to adequately execute the proposed research plan;
- International experience (e.g., international collaborations and participation in international scientific networks);
- Actions to obtain funding, e.g., grant applications for individuals and/or projects;
- Experience in teaching and mentoring (master, doctoral and post-doctoral supervision);
- Indicators of research independence and/or of scientific leadership should be mentioned, if applicable.
- Prizes, honours and awards;
- Other activities, such as management of science, technology and innovation programmes or projects, outreach activities and dissemination of knowledge, namely for the promotion of culture and scientific practices;
- Applicant's motivations and career perspectives;
- Interruptions on scientific activity due to parental leave, serious illness, unconventional path/gaps and how they have impacted activity.

**The Panel must not penalize aspects that are beyond the requirements for the specific career level, namely when assessing Junior and Assistant research levels.**

**When assessing the research activity of the applicants the panel should only consider effectively accomplished achievements and published research outputs.**

The CIÊNCIAVITAE CV contained in the application is only informative and will not to be assessed.

## CRITERION B

The assessment of the **Merit of the Research Plan** should take into consideration the following aspects:

- i. Relevance and innovative nature of the proposed research plan, based on the state of the art, the previous work done by the applicant, goals and expected outcomes, and its progress beyond the current state of the art;
- ii. Adequacy of the methodology adopted and feasibility of the research plan in a 6-year period;
- iii. How the proposed research plan, the expected results and applicant's motivations fit into the overall research strategy and mission of the host institution;
- iv. If ethical issues are identified and properly addressed (when applicable), according to the [Ethics Self-Assessment Guide](#).

The aim of this Call is to fund researchers for a 6-year period to pursue a research plan within a host institution

## 5. SCORING SYSTEM

The assessment of each criterion uses a **10-point scale** with 0.1 increments. The maximum score is 10.0 and the minimum is 1.0, as presented in Table I.

**Table I** – Qualitative descriptors associated to the 10-point scale

Classification	Score	Strengths / Weaknesses (guidance for criteria evaluation)
<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>10.0</b>	Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses
<b>Extremely high</b>	<b>9.0</b>	Extremely strong with one/some negligible weakness(es)
<b>Very high</b>	<b>8.0</b>	Very strong with one/some minor weakness(es)
<b>High</b>	<b>7.0</b>	Strong with at least one moderate weakness
	<b>6.0</b>	Strong with several moderate weaknesses
<b>Medium</b>	<b>5.0</b>	Some strengths with significant weaknesses
	<b>4.0</b>	Some strengths with several major weaknesses
<b>Low</b>	<b>3.0</b>	Few strengths and major weaknesses
	<b>2.0</b>	Very few strengths and serious weaknesses
<b>Fail</b>	<b>1.0</b>	Cannot be assessed*

\*An application can be considered non-assessable when it strays considerably outside the scope of the panel (not applicable to multi/interdisciplinary applications) or is submitted in a language different from English.

The final score (FS) is given by the following formula:

$$FS = 0.6A + 0.4B$$

Each criterion is scored individually with **one decimal place**. The **final score (FS)** is presented with **two decimal places**. In cases of ties in the final score, the score awarded to **criterion B** is considered for **tie-breaking purposes**.

- The minimum merit threshold for an application to be considered for funding is 8.00 (FS)  
- Applicants whose application is scored with a FS lower than 5.00 will be hindered from applying in the next edition of the Stimulus of Scientific Employment, Individual Support Call

## 6. EVALUATION PROCESS

### 6.1 CONSTITUTION OF THE EVALUATION PANELS

- Evaluation panels are formed by international reviewers appointed by the Board of Directors of FCT and will be announced on the FCT website before the preliminary hearing period. All reviewers are of recognized competence in the scientific areas of the applications under evaluation and cannot be affiliated with any Portuguese R&D institution;
- The constitution of the evaluation panels takes into consideration the number of submitted applications and their scientific areas and subareas, the gender balance of its members; geographical and institutional distribution of reviewers' affiliations;
- No direct contact between applicants and any member of the evaluation panels is allowed under penalty of exclusion from the call;
- The evaluators are bound by confidentiality regarding the applications and all stages of the evaluation process;
- Each panel has a **Chair responsible for**:
  - 1) Assisting FCT with panel constitution by suggesting possible reviewers;
  - 2) Assigning the applications to panel members;
  - 3) Keeping the evaluation process within the defined timeframe and contacting panel members in case of any delays;
  - 4) Supporting the FCT team in solving Conflict of Interest (CoI) identified during the evaluation process;
  - 5) Suggesting external reviewers who may provide an additional assessment of specific applications, namely multi/interdisciplinary applications, whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
  - 6) Assuring the quality of the reports: comments should be consistent with the scores, respect the scoring system ( Section 5), provide substantive arguments and identifying both strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation criterion;
  - 7) Leading the panel meeting discussion.

The Chair may assess up to 10 applications whenever appropriate, such as in situations of CoI or to cover a particular scientific expertise.

### 6.2 EVALUATION STAGES

The evaluation process of the applications comprises the following stages:

- 1) Applications eligibility and assignment to the reviewers;

- 2) Remote evaluation:
  - a) Individual phase;
  - b) Consensus phase;
- 3) Panel Meeting.

## APPLICATIONS ELIGIBILITY AND ASSIGNMENT

- FCT is responsible for eligibility verification of submitted applications according to binding criteria described in the announcement. However, an application can be declared ineligible at any stage of the evaluation. If any doubts arise during the evaluation, the panel Chair and FCT should be informed;
- Each application will be remotely and **individually assessed by two panel members**, one lead reviewer (1st reader/rapporteur) of the application and a second (2nd) reader;
- The panel Chair is responsible for assigning the applications to lead reviewers and 2nd readers;
- An external reviewer may be assigned by the Chair to a given application whenever a particular expertise is not covered by the panel;
- The distribution of the applications to panel members and external reviewers (if applicable) will necessarily take into consideration the declaration of Col and the matching of professional and scientific expertise of the reviewers within the topic of the application.

## REMOTE EVALUATION

### a) INDIVIDUAL PHASE

- Before the assessment, the reviewers have to declare whether or not a Col is identified for each application (Section 7.2);
- If a disqualifying Col with a particular application is identified, the Panel Chair and FCT must be informed, and the application will be reassigned by the Chair to a different reviewer;
- If a potential Col with a particular application is identified, the panel member must notify FCT that will analyse and decide if an unbiased evaluation may be made or if the conflict should rather be maintained and the reviewer excluded from the assessment;
- Panel members must submit an individual report with their assessment for each application assigned to them. This report includes:
  - ✓ Scores for each criterion and respective comments **including strengths and weaknesses**;
  - ✓ A comment concerning ethical issues, if applicable;
  - ✓ Identification of the research plan's alignment with the framework of any of the [2030 UN Agenda Goals](#)<sup>5</sup>;
  - ✓ Confidential comments to the evaluation panel and/or FCT, if necessary.

---

<sup>5</sup> The alignment with 1 or 2 the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN 2030 Agenda is a requirement for the scientific employment contracts to be co-funded with European Structural and Investment Funds.

- The reviewers should perform their **assessments considering different standards for each research level** (from Junior to Coordinating researcher) and **only based in the information provided and included in the application**.
- Both readers must submit their individual evaluation prior to the beginning of the consensus phase.
- An application **can be considered non-assessable as referred in Section 5. Applications muti/interdisciplinary should not be considered non-assessable without strong scientific evidence that they do not fit into the panel scope**.
- A non-assessable application must be confirmed by the panel Chair and if considered out of the scope, **it cannot be moved to a different evaluation panel**. The following procedure should be taken for these applications when filling in the report:
  - ✓ Score both criteria 1.0;
  - ✓ State in the report that the panel could not assess the application and the reason for that.

**The evaluation panel must jointly validate this decision during the panel meeting.**

#### **b) CONSENSUS PHASE**

- The panel member appointed as **1st reader prepares the consensus report for each application based on the two individual reviews** (and the external expert's assessment, if applicable) to be submitted to the panel;
- If the 1st reader is unable to reach a consensus report based on the two individual reviews the Chair should be informed and settle these differences (if necessary, by obtaining a third opinion from another member of the panel);
- The consensus report, similar in structure to the individual reports, is the starting point for the discussion during the panel meeting. Comments **must include strengths and weaknesses for each evaluation criterion** and be in agreement with the given scores (see Table I).

#### **PANEL MEETING**

- Each evaluation panel meeting will be remotely coordinated by the Chair to proceed with the following activities:
  - ✓ Ensure a fair judgment and an appropriate discussion of each application;
  - ✓ Settle the final scores for each criterion, as well as the comments to be conveyed to the applicants, and **ensure that the scores are in agreement with the comments**. Final comments should be included in the panel evaluation report by the 1st reader (according to the guidelines specified in Section 6.3);
  - ✓ Guarantee that the adopted criteria are coherent within and across each research contract level (Junior, Assistant, Principal and Coordinating);

- ✓ Prepare a provisional ranked list of all applications under evaluation for each of the four levels;
- ✓ Prepare a panel meeting report with a summary of the meeting addressing the following issues:
  - Working methodology adopted by the panel;
  - Identification of Conflict of Interest;
  - The provisional ranked list of all applications for each of the four research contract levels.

**This report is signed by the Chair after the agreement of all panel members.**

- ✓ Prepare an additional document with recommendations to FCT on the different aspects of the evaluation process that may help FCT improve procedures in future calls.

Only the applications with the **highest final scores, equal to or above 8.00, are eligible to be selected for funding, up to the number of available positions**. The selection will follow the ranked list for each contract level within each panel.

The distribution of available positions by panel and contract levels will be set by the Board of Directors of FCT taking as reference a proportional distribution of the number of positions to each research contract level and panel in relation to the number of eligible applications. However, panels have the flexibility to adjust the selection of the positions to be funded considering the quality of the applications evaluated in each research level.

### **6.3 FEEDBACK TO BE TRANSMITTED TO APPLICANTS**

All the reviewers should comply with the following additional guidelines in the elaboration of the panel evaluation reports.

#### **Comments must:**

- Be coherent with the scoring descriptors (Section 5);
- Be clear and consistent, **and include strengths and weaknesses** of the application for each criterion;
- Take into account the research level of the application (Junior, Assistant, Principal and Coordinating);
- Use dispassionate and analytical language. Avoid dismissive statements about the applicant, the proposed science or the concerned scientific field;
- Be polite;
- Address the submitted work plan and not the work reviewers may consider that should have been proposed.

#### **Comments must not:**

- Give a description or a summary of the application;
- Use the first person or equivalent (*e.g.*, “I think...”, “This reviewer finds...”). Instead, use expressions such as “The panel...” or “It is considered...” should be used;
- Ask questions as the applicant will not be able to answer them;
- Provide recommendations or advice for improving the application;
- Have contradicting statements;
- Mention quantitative details that can easily originate factual mistakes.

**The quality of the comments to be transmitted to the applicants is of paramount importance and part of the evaluation process, therefore being a major task of the evaluation panel**

## **7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

### **7.1 CONFIDENTIALITY**

The confidentiality of the applications must be protected. All reviewers involved in the evaluation are asked not to copy, quote, or otherwise use material from the applications. All reviewers are also requested to agree with a statement of confidentiality relative to the contents of the applications, the evaluation process and the evaluation results.

### **7.2 CONFLICT OF INTEREST (CoI)**

Researchers who applied to the present call cannot participate in the evaluation process. Those with first-degree relationships, domestic partnership or married to an applicant are also hindered from being a member of the panel to which the application was submitted. **Any CoI must be declared prior to the evaluation process.**

#### **DISQUALIFYING CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

In case a **disqualifying CoI** is identified, the panel member **cannot evaluate the respective application**. Circumstances that should be interpreted as a disqualifying CoI are the following:

1. Personal or financial interest in the application's success;
2. Current or planned close scientific cooperation;
3. Research cooperation (*e.g.*, joint publications) within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
4. Dependent employment relationship or supervisory relationship (*e.g.*, teacher-student relationship up to and including the post-doctoral phase), within the last 3 years before the opening date of the call;
5. Affiliation, or pending transfer, to any Department, Institution or Research Centre involved in the application;

6. Be an active member in a Council or similar Supervisory Board of the Department, Institution or Research Centre to which the applicant has been affiliated to within the last 3 years or will be connected to in the scope of the application.

#### **POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

In the case of a **potential Col**, FCT will analyse and decide if the reviewer is able to perform an unbiased evaluation, removing the declared Col, or if the conflict should rather be maintained and the panel member excluded from the assessment of the application. A potential Col exists in the following circumstances:

7. Relationships other than first-degree, marriage or domestic partnership; other personal ties or conflicts;
8. Professional relationships, other than those listed under no. 4;
9. Participation in University Bodies other than those listed under no. 6, *e.g.*, Scientific Advisory Committees in research environment;
10. Involvement in a Project with a closely related research topic (competition issues);
11. Participating in an on-going scientific or inter-personal conflict with the applicant(s);
12. Any other circumstances the reviewer feels that may not be impartial.

**In case of a declared Col, the reviewer will not be involved in the evaluation nor participate in the discussion of the application during the panel meeting.** The Panel meeting report must mention Cols for all panel members.

#### **8. PRELIMINARY HEARINGS**

Once the provisional ranked lists of the evaluation results are communicated, applicants may use their right to dispute the proposed decision in the preliminary hearing phase, which takes place during the **10 working days following the communication of results**.

At this stage, panel members are asked to give support to FCT through the analysis of the submitted complains. The Chair should guarantee the quality of the comments to be transmitted to the applicants.

Comments of scientific nature will be analysed by the evaluation panel that previously evaluated the application and will also be responsible for correcting possible misjudgements or clarifying alleged inaccuracies.

The analysis of these comments is **neither a second assessment** of the application **nor an additional opportunity for the applicant to present new information**. It should only serve to identify any error that may have occurred during the evaluation and that is now addressed by the applicant. Any identified error should be corrected and, depending on its nature, the score may be changed accordingly or remain the same.

**The applicants must submit their comments in English and shall use appropriate language.**

## **APPENDIX I – APPLICATION SECTIONS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEWERS**

### **PERSONAL DATA**

Name

Gender

Nationality

### **CURRICULUM VITAE – CIÊNCIAVITAE (pdf file)**

#### **PHD DEGREE**

Completion Date

PhD graduation country

PhD graduation institution

#### **APPLICATION DATA**

##### **GENERAL DESCRIPTION**

Research contract level

Title of the research plan

Abstract (**3000 characters**)

Keywords (maximum 5)

Main Scientific Area

Secondary Scientific Area

Subarea

Evaluation Panel

##### **MOTIVATION LETTER AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN (5000 characters)**

##### **CV SYNOPSIS**

Synopsis of the scientific and curricular path (**4000 characters**)

Major activities and results (**3000 characters**)

The top five scientific achievements (**500 characters each**)

##### **RESEARCH PLAN**

Background (**3000 characters**)

Research plan and methods (**7000 characters**)

Expected outcomes (**2000 characters**)

Ethical issues (If applicable, **2000 characters**)

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals - 2030 Agenda (minimum 1, maximum 2)

Compliance with the goals of the 2030 Agenda (800 **characters**)

References (3000 **characters**)

**HOST INSTITUTION**

Selection of the host institution

Description of the host conditions (**800 characters**)

Integration of the research plan into the host institution's strategy (**800 characters**)

## APPENDIX II – MAIN AND SECONDARY SCIENTIFIC AREAS, CORRESPONDING SUBAREAS AND EVALUATION PANELS

This appendix lists the main and secondary scientific areas and the corresponding subareas, adapted from the [OECD's revised Field of Science and Technology Classification - FOS](#), as well as the respective Evaluation Panels. Each evaluation Panel is responsible for the applications from a set of scientific subareas.

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel	
Exact Sciences	Mathematics	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics and Computer and Information Sciences	
		Applied Mathematics		
		Statistics and Probability		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Computer and information sciences	Computer Sciences		
		Information Sciences		
		Bioinformatics		
		Informatics		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Physical Sciences	Atomic, Molecular and Chemical Physics		Physical Sciences
		Condensed Matter Physics		
		Particles Physics		
		Nuclear Physics		
		Fluids and Plasma Physics		
		Optics		
		Acoustics		
		Astronomy		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Chemical Sciences	Organic Chemistry	Chemical Sciences	
		Inorganic Chemistry		
		Physical Chemistry		
		Polymer Science		
		Electrochemistry		
		Colloid Chemistry		
		Analytical Chemistry		
		Nuclear Chemistry		
		Medicinal Chemistry		
<i>Other, please specify:</i>				

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Natural Sciences	Earth and Related Environmental Sciences	Geosciences, Multidisciplinary	Earth Sciences
		Mineralogy	
		Palaeontology	
		Geochemistry	
		Geophysics	
		Geology	
		Physical Geography	
		Volcanology	
		Meteorology and Atmospheric Sciences	
		Climatic Research	
		Oceanography	
		Hydrology and Water Resources	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Earth and Related Environmental Sciences	Climate Change	Environmental Sciences
		Environmental Management	
		Ecotoxicology	
		Environmental Monitoring and Impact	
		Natural Resources and Sustainability	
		Waste Management and Valorisation	
		Water and pollution	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Biological Sciences	Cell Biology	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry
		Biochemistry	
		Biochemical Research Methods	
		Microbiology	
		Molecular Biology	
		Biophysics	
		Genetics and Heredity	
		Reproductive Biology	
		Virology	
Developmental Biology			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
	<b>Biological Sciences</b>	Plant Sciences and Botany	Biological Sciences
		Zoology, Ornithology, Entomology	
		Marine Biology, Freshwater Biology and Limnology	
		Ecology	
		Biodiversity Conservation	
		Biology (Theoretical, Mathematical)	
		Evolutionary Biology	
		Behavioural Sciences Biology	
		Mycology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Engineering and Technology	Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	Civil and Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
		Municipal and Structural Engineering	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Electrical Engineering, Electronic Engineering, Information Engineering	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and Control Systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering	Civil and Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems
		Applied Mechanics	
		Thermodynamics	
		Aerospace Engineering	
		Nuclear Engineering	
		Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis	
		Engineering Systems	
Renewable Energies			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	
	Chemical Process Engineering		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnology	
	Ceramics		
	Coating and Films		
	Composites		
	Paper and Wood		
	Textiles		
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
	<b>Medical Engineering</b>	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biotechnology
		Laboratory Technology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	<b>Environmental Engineering</b>	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Geotechnics	
		Petroleum Engineering, Energy and Fuels	
		Remote Sensing	
		Mining and Mineral Processing	
		Geological Engineering	
		Marine Engineering, Sea Vessels	
		Ocean Engineering	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	<b>Environmental Biotechnology</b>	Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Bioremediation, Diagnostic Biotechnologies (DNA Chips and Biosensing Devices) in Environmental Management	
		Environmental Biotechnology related Ethics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	<b>Industrial Biotechnology</b>	Industrial Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology and Engineering and Industrial Biotechnology
		Bioprocessing Technologies, Biocatalysis and Fermentation	
		Bioproducts, Biomaterials, Bioplastics, Biofuels, Bio-derived Bulk and Fine Chemicals and Bio-derived Novel Materials	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
<b>Nanotechnology</b>	Nanomaterials	Materials Engineering and Nanotechnology	
	Nanoprocesses		
	Nano-Optics and Nanophotonics		
	Modelling at Nanoscale		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Medical and Health Sciences	Basic Medicine	Anatomy and Morphology	Basic and Clinical Medicine
		Human Genetics	
		Immunology	
		Neurosciences	
		Pharmacology	
		Toxicology	
		Physiology	
		Pathology	
		Oncobiology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
		Clinical Medicine	
	Obstetrics and Gynecology		
	Paediatrics		
	Cardiac and Cardiovascular System		
	Peripheral Vascular Disease		
	Haematology		
	Respiratory Systems		
	Critical Care Medicine and Emergency Medicine		
	Anaesthesiology		
	Orthopaedics		
	Surgery		
	Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Medical Imaging		
	Transplantation		
	Dentistry, Oral Surgery and Medicine		
	Dermatology		
	Infectious Diseases		
	Allergology		
	Rheumatology		
	Endocrinology and Metabolism		
	Gastroenterology and Hepatology		
	Urology and Nephrology		
	Oncology		
	Ophthalmology		
Otorhinolaryngology			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel	
		Psychiatry		
		Clinical Neurology		
		Geriatrics and Gerontology		
		General and Family Medicine		
		Internal Medicine		
		Integrative and Complementary Medicine		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	<b>Health Sciences</b>	Health Care and Services	Health Sciences	
		Health Services and Policies		
		Nursing		
		Nutrition, Dietetics		
		Public Health and Environmental Health		
		Epidemiology		
		Occupational Health		
		Sport and Fitness Sciences		
		Social Biomedical Sciences		
		Medical Ethics		
		Addiction		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
		Tropical Medicine		Basic and Clinical Medicine
		Parasitology		
	<b>Medical Biotechnology</b>	Health-related Biotechnology	Medical Engineering and Biotechnology	
		Technologies involving the Manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the Whole Organisms		
		Gene-based Diagnose and Therapies		
		Biomaterials		
		Medical Biotechnology related Ethics		
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Agricultural Sciences	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agriculture	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Forestry	
		Fishery	
		Soil Science	
		Horticulture and Viticulture	
		Agronomy, Plant Breeding and Plant Protection	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences and Agro-Food Biotechnology
		Husbandry	
		Pets	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Veterinary Science	Veterinary Science	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Agricultural Biotechnology	Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Biotechnology	
		GM Technology (crops and livestock) and Livestock Cloning	
		Marker Assisted Selection	
		Diagnostics	
		Biomass Feedstock Production Technologies, Biopharming	
		Agricultural Biotechnology related Ethics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Social Sciences	Psychology	Criminal Psychology	Psychology
		Social and Organizational Psychology	
		Cognitive Psychology and Neuropsychology	
		Clinical Psychology	
		Psychology of Development and Learning	
		Educational Psychology	
		Community and Health Psychology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Economics and Business	Economics	Economics and Business, Social and Economic Geography
		Business and Management	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Educational Sciences	General Education (including Training, Pedagogy, Didactics)	Educational Sciences
		Special Education (to gifted persons, those with learning disabilities)	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Sociology	Sociology	Sociology
		Demography	
		Anthropology	
		Ethnology	
		Social Topics (women's and gender studies, social issues, family studies, social work)	
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
Law	Public Law	Media and Communications, Law and Political Science	
	Criminal Law		
	Private Law		
	European and International Law		
	Human Rights		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
Political Sciences	Political Science		
	Military Sciences		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Compared Politics	
		Political Theory	
		International Relations	
		Public Policy	
		European Studies	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	<b>Social and Economic Geography</b>	Environmental Sciences (social aspects)	Economics and Business, Social and Economic Geography
		Cultural and Economic Geography	
		Urban Studies (planning and development)	
		Transport Planning and Social Aspects of Transport	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	<b>Media and Communications</b>	Journalism and Media	Media and Communications, Law and Political Science
		Documental and Information Sciences	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
Humanities	History and Archaeology	Ancient History	History
		Medieval History	
		Modern History	
		Contemporary History	
		History of Science and Technology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
		Prehistory and Archaeology	Prehistory and Archaeology
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Languages and Literature	Literature	Languages and Literature
		Portuguese Studies	
		Romantic Studies	
		Anglophone Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		Asian and African Studies	
		Germanic Studies	
		Linguistics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	Epistemology in Philosophy of Science	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
		Methaphysics and Philosophical Anthropology	
		Philosophy of Art	
Logic			
History of Philosophy			
Ethics and Political Philosophy			
Theology and Religion Philosophy			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
Arts	Fine Arts	Arts	
	Musicology		
	Visual Performative Arts (Cinema, Television, Drama, Dance, etc.)		
	Art History		
	Conservation and Restoration		
	Museology		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel
		Architecture	Architecture, Urbanism, Design and Cultural Heritage
		Urbanism	
		Design	
		Cultural Heritage	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	