

# **The e-ASIA JOINT RESEARCH PROGRAM**

## **APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS**



**e-ASIA JRP**

**April 2018**

# **APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE e-ASIA JOINT RESEARCH PROGRAM**

## Introduction

As decided at the e-ASIA Joint Research Program (hereinafter referred to as “the Program”) 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Board Meeting (held on the 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> of August 2016), the Board shall establish an “Application Review Process for the e-ASIA Joint Research Program” document as follows, which is stipulated in item 3 of Article 6 of the Program Statute in order to secure transparency and clarity of the Program’s application review process. The terms used in this document follow the terms used in the Program Statute.

## Review Structure

- (1) Review of applications is conducted in coordination and consultation among the member organizations (hereinafter singularly referred to as a “Party” and plurally as “Parties”) participating in a call for proposals, based on the review results of each Party.
- (2) Upon the request of the Board, the Program Secretariat conducts the overall operation management for the review of applications as the joint call secretariat.
- (3) After the review of applications by the participating Parties, approval of projects for award is made by the Board.

## Review Criteria

- (1) The following common review criteria of the Program are applied:
  - 1) Regional Relevance of the Research  
The research activity should contribute to:
    - The advancement of scientific discovery;
    - The development of science and technology in the region; and

- The resolution of significant issues across the region.

## 2) Mutual Benefits of the Joint Research

Activities of mutual benefit to the collaborators and their institutions are desirable. The projects are considered to be mutually beneficial in that they utilize unique opportunities the e-ASIA JRP will provide that could not be achieved either through bilateral or individual research, but only through multilateral cooperation.

## 3) Effectiveness of Exchange

The project should:

- Conduct activities to foster the development of early career researchers through research activities;
- Conduct activities to engage female researchers where strengthening capacity is needed; and
- Enhance research capacity in the region.

- (2) In addition to the common review criteria, each Party may apply their own review criteria as part of their internal review process. These review criteria, as applicable, will also be stated in the “Information about each Party”, in the Appendix of the call Guideline.
- (3) How these review criteria are addressed in the review process of each Party will depend on their review policy.

## Review Process

After closing a call period, all the proposals duly submitted to the joint call secretariat by the Lead Principal Investigator (hereinafter referred to as “Lead PI”) proceed to the review process below.

### (1) Review Process of each Party

- (a) Eligibility check: Upon receipt of the proposals from the joint call secretariat, each Party shall conduct eligibility check on all the applications that involve PIs from their own country, according to the regulations of each Party.
- (b) Scientific review: Each Party reviews those proposals to be considered whether the proposals would be worth supporting based

on the review criteria above.

- (c) Each Party submits their review results of the proposals, together with their comments, to the joint call secretariat.

(2) Joint Review Process

- (a) Based on the review results submitted to the joint call secretariat, Parties jointly review the evaluation results of each Party pursuant to the condition described below, and through discussion determine the candidate projects for adoption.
- (b) Proposals that meet the following conditions will be the candidate projects for award in the order from the highest evaluated proposals, based on the number of the projects each Party can support\*.
  - (i) Proposals evaluated as “able to support” by at least three Parties
  - (ii) Proposals evaluated as “able to support” with the Lead PI’s funding requirements by the Party of the Lead PI (i.e., if the Lead PI is unable to participate in-kind and the Party supports only in-kind participation, the proposal will be ineligible).
  - (iii) At least one of the research team applicants must participate via “new” or “re-budgeted” funding. In other words, proposals cannot be accepted as e-ASIA projects if all the applicants intend to participate through an “in-kind” basis.

\*Funding Modality:

New: to support a project by new funding,

Re-budgeting: Funds allocated to an existing project from the Member Organization will be reallocated to the e-ASIA JRP collaborative project,

In-kind: The Member Organization of his/her country does not provide a budget. A researcher participates in a project using funds/resources that are already available, but no additional funding will be provided by the Member Organization from his/her country.

Process for Approval

- (1) Each Party invokes their internal procedures to officially approve the candidate projects for adoption.
- (2) After each Party's approval is obtained, approval of projects for award will be made by the Board.
- (3) The joint call secretariat announces the review results approved by the Board to the Lead PI of each proposal. Each Party is encouraged to announce to the PIs the review findings regarding strength and weakness of the projects, especially the unselected ones.

#### Approval Date

This document was approved on April 13, 2018