

**MO Forum on Peer Review  
the 9<sup>th</sup> working group meeting**

**Item 4: Debate and decision on future activities and  
actions for the MO Forum on Peer Review**

*17 November 2010, Strasbourg*

**Farzam Ranjbaran,**  
Head of Corporate Science Operations  
European Science Foundation

## Where we are now

- ▶ **EUROHORCS-ESF evolution**
- ▶ **Roadmap of Actions**
  - **Peer Review Guide and Survey**
  - **Remaining activities**
  - **Timeframe**

## **1- Peer Review Guide and Survey:**

- a. Remaining issues for further development
- b. Further analysis of the data collected
- c. Finalising and releasing the Peer Review Guide and Survey Report
- d. Time-frame:
  - Content finished Jan 2011
  - Release and dissemination March 2011

## 2- Common European Referee Database

- a. The need has been explored/established
- b. Key aspects and features to be elaborate or defined
- c. Project Plan being prepared
- d. Contributions from the MO forum on identifying main requirements and scenarios are envisaged
- e. EuroCRIS and Cerif Standards
- f. Time-Frame: 2 years

### **3. Role of incentives for reviewers**

- a. Analysis of the current approaches
- b. Short term gains versus long term impacts
- c. Room for harmonisation
- d. Non-Monetary incentives
- e. Aim for firmer policy statements and required actions at European level

## 4. MICT and breakthrough research proposals

- a. Continue the discussions and elaborate on the common approaches
- b. Aim for firmer policy statements and required actions at European level
- c. Taxonomy (disciplinary versus keyword clustering)
- d. Role of dedicated panels and committees

## 5. Use of bibliometrics

- a. Elaboration of current trends and practices
- b. Measurement of quantity versus quality
- c. Role of commercial databases
- d. Aim for firmer policy statements and actions

## 6. Peer Review versus Evaluation

- a. Relationship and synergy between peer review used in project selection versus ex-post evaluation and impact assessment
- b. Intensify interactions between the two Fora
- c. Taxonomy of disciplines
- d. EuroCRIS and Cerif Standards



## **7. Web-based repository for MOs**

- a. Including Peer Review and Evaluation
- b. Peer Review Guide and Survey Report
- c. Promotion of common approaches
- d. Link to other existing Guidelines and resources
- e. Taxonomies
- f. EuroCRIS and Cerif Standards

# Priorities of the items