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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
Remaining items for discussion and prioritisation by the Forum:

2- Common European Referee Database

- The need has been explored/established
- Key aspects and features to be elaborate or defined
- Project Plan being prepared
- Contributions from the MO forum on identifying main requirements and scenarios are envisaged
- EuroCRIS and Cerif Standards
- Time-Frame: 2 years
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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
Remaining items for discussion and prioritisation by the Forum:

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