Preparation of LIP's yearly technical and public reports and plans 2019/20

A. General procedures and calendar

A.1 The update of the scientific production indicators should be done along the year, preferably at the time of the event itself. This should include paper publications, theses, talks at conferences, organization of local events, group outreach events, such as the talks in schools and other.... Only in this way the information displayed on LIP's public website will be up to date. The editorial team will send a reminder to all PIs to do these updates once a month. C4 representatives of each research line can contribute making sure this is the case for the groups in their line. For the vast majority of the groups, the number of papers, conferences, theses, etc. is manageable. For other centrally updated cases (e.g. LHC publications), they will be done three times in the year and will require verification by the PIs.

A.2 The update of the team member information should be done along the year, preferably when people leave or arrive. Again, only in this way the information displayed on LIP's public website will be up to date. It should be noted that while upon filling the new member form the person is inserted in the DB by the secretariat, making sure the person is inserted in the right project and with the right percentage remains the responsibility of the group PI (or at least the information must be provided to the secretariat). For master and PhD students, it is important that the thesis information is also inserted and kept updated in the DB — title, supervisor, start date.

A.3 PIs must insert (final and complete versions of) the text reports in the DB during the month of January — this is meant to take advantage of the gap between semesters. Delays in this step have an impact both on the editing timings and in the revision process, making final versions to be checked only by a small number of people. The calendar is approved in the December CC and announced in the last newsletter of the year. A reminder will be sent in the first working day of January, and checks of missing reports will start one week before the end of the month.

A.4 The usual revision procedures will be kept; new ones involving the C4 are proposed:
- Technical report: the revision of the group report remains the responsibility of each PI and other group members that may be involved. A general revision of the technical report is done by the editorial team. Each C4 research line representative is expected to do a minimal check of the technical reports of the groups belonging to his/her research line and send it to the editorial team. For example: — is the report there on time? Are there missing sections? Are there obvious missing items in the scientific production? Is the english adequate?
- Public report: the preparation of the draft is done by the editorial team, based on the technical report. C4 research line representatives will receive first-hand the draft text of his line and collaborate in its improvement, with both corrections and suggestions on clarity and selection of highlights; all C4 members should look closely at least at the public report.

A5. Calendar 2019/2020
31 Dez 2019 Deadline for updating all team and scientific production in the DB
31 Jan 2020 Deadline for inserting all final group texts in the DB
14 Fev 2020 Circulation of the Technical Report for comments
28 Fev 2020 Deadline for sending comments on the Technical Report to the Editorial Board
28 Fev 2020 Circulation of the Public Report for comments
13 Mar 2020 Deadline for sending comments on the Public Report to the Editorial Board
27 Mar 2020 Deadline for sending the preliminary reports to the Advisory Board members
15 Apr 2020 International Advisory Board meeting

B. General DB logic: a reminder and some advice/guidelines

B.1 The DB is organized in research groups, which are the basic research entities at LIP, with continuity over the years (both in research subject and core team) and are approved by the CC. Each group may have several funded projects, which change over time, and also conduct activities that are not part of funded project. LIP's Technical report includes reports/plans of the different groups (not project reports, which may however be requested by the funding entities).

B2. In the DB, a group is a sum of projects: the information is put inside a specific project and the BD adds its up to compute the group info. This logic is meant to make sure that what is inside the LIP DB is as close as possible to what was really approved by FCT or other funding agencies, is registered there, and will be written in reports for funding agencies, concerning both scientific production and FTEs. A reminder on how should this be used:

- Scientific production can be inserted in more than one project, belonging or not to the same group. They are then listed in the several places where they should, counted as production of the several groups where they should (project-level info is not shown in the reports), but in the global tables adding up all groups there is no double counting.
- Each project has a team, and the team of the group is the sum of the different projects it includes, taking into account dates.
- In most groups, there is a part of reality (a period of time or a part of the activities) thats is not described by the funded projects. To cope with this, a project with the name starting by "000" is usually added (Example: 000-SNO-2009). The correct way to use the 000 projects is to create one for each year, (e.g. 000-SNO-2007, 000-SNO-2009), include there all the items that for that year are not in the funded projects, and leave it there forever. Having a single 000 project with sliding dates and re-use every year, as it is sometimes tempting to do, creates confusion because we can no longer reproduce past reports. Please avoid it in the future. What is included in the 000 projects: team members that are not in the funded projects; all activities in periods of times when there were no funded projects; extra percentages or collaboration periods of people that are in funded projects, etc.

B3. Please note this affects only the Technical report: in the public one, no FTE percentages are listed. This may seem a bit intricate (specially before you get used to it), but it is reality itself that became more complex over time, with more and more fragmented funding and time gaps between projects. Also, the DB was not thought from scratch for the many tasks and important roles that it has today. But we do not have any volunteers to re-do everything, and besides it works :-)

B4. Some aspects that will be improved this year

- **LIP-wide events**: Large events which are not organized by a single group, but rather with the collaboration of many group or central LIP services should be linked to the 000-LIPSCS-2019 project, within the "Scientific Conferences and Seminars" group, so that they appear automatically in the report.
- **Event classification**: With the goal of improving uniformity in the classification of events (both events where group members delivered presentations and events organized by the group) the event types will be revised and examples or short explanations will be provided in the DB. In case of conflicting classifications for the same event or clear misclassifications the editorial board will decide.
- **Paper classification**: to avoid different criteria, we decide that can be considered as "Direct contribution" papers in which the group did not participate directly in the data analysis but had an important role in the internal review process (e.g.: extensive rewrites, analysis corrections/ updates, etc…).
- **Conflicting dates**: If the DB detects a conflict between the association dates of a person to a project and to LIP, an automated email will be sent to the PI and the secretariat, in order for an appropriate action to be taken.
- **Project cloning**: A new functionality will be provided in the DB, to allow cloning an existing project, to facilitate creating a new one. It will require verification of the team members by the PI.

C. A more detailed look on the question of team and FTE percentages

C1. In the last few years, we have merged the report and plan into a single document, so we present just one team. Sometimes it is not clear for people to which year this team corresponds. The rules are the following:

- The team and the FTEs correspond to the year that now finished (and we are reporting on), because this is the reality we know for sure
- Remember the DB allows to add, in a single project, more than one relation to a person. One can specify between month X and month Y a given percentage, and add another relation of the same person between month Y and month Z with a different percentage B. Then, the total percentage of this person per year is OK, and the DB reflects the reality.
- When there are big changes already foreseen for the next year, it may be useful to signal them to the reader. Typical cases are:
  - People who will come in the next year: we list the new team member assigning no % and adding a note "starting in 2020"
  - People who left during or at the end of the year: we list a team member with the actual % and add a note "left in…"

C2. We would like that the percentages/FTEs in the DB meet the following:

- Correspond to the percentages that are in the projects approved by FCT (or other entities)
- Not to have collaborators adding up to more than 100%
- To give the reader, in particular the LIP Associates and the International Advisory Board a realistic vision of our activities and of the resources dedicated to them in the past year.

C3. Reality is ever more complex and to achieve these three goals at the same time may become virtually impossible. We thus propose some guidelines on how to keep things as close as possible to reality and how to use the adjustment variables that we have in our hands:

- For small differences, (up to 105 or 110%), usually due to short duration co-existence of projects, the best is probably not to touch the DB and to adjust to 100% in the edited report.
- It is of course normal to submit project adding up to more than 100% before we know what will be approved. It is important afterwards (i.e., at "homologation" time) to put things back in order both in the DB and in FCT.
- When there are big differences between what was actually submitted and what is being executed (e.g. team or calendar) this should be communicated to FCT and updated.
- When projects take a long time to be homologated, what is in FCT may no longer correspond to reality and there is not even the chance to update it. The best may be to update the DB and to change it in FCT as soon as possible.
- In some very specific cases, duplication may be unavoidable and the best is to correct by hand in the report: e.g., a student that has to be at 100% in the European project that pays his grant but then has also to be part of the CERN fund team where he/she will do the work.
- 000 projects are very useful to cover the (sometimes huge) gap between funded projects and performed activities. We should create one per group and per year, and add there the team members that are not in funded projects or extra percentages of team members that are already there.

C4. FCT has for people's assigned FTE in projects:

- a minimum of 15% for all team members
- a minimum of 35% for project PIs
- not more than 100% for the sum of the FTE in all FCT-funded projects, for any team member
- Reference: article 3 of the regulations (a few years old, but still valid according to the FAQ): https://www.fct.pt/apoios/projectos/regulamento.phtml.en .

In addition to these well-known rules, all groups should follow as closely as possible a set of guidelines for what "FTE" means, in order to ensure a reasonable uniformity within LIP. This might often be hard, when people participate in several projects, do teaching or admin work, and the actual times dedicated to all that are not easy to estimate. Still, there are FCT indications that we should aim to follow as much as we can:

- The indicated FTE should be the fraction of the time dedicated to the project over the full time for professional activities, research or otherwise, i.e. including teaching, administration, etc... For exemple, if you teach, you should not indicate 100% FTE.
- By full time, it is intended the actual time worked, and not a fixed number of hours. So, even if you estimate to work more than the “normal” working time, that does’t matter, the counting is still over the total.
- These indications are taken from FCT regulations and indications:
    - “The convention adopted by the OECD applies here. A full-time week for a researcher is not a fixed number of hours, but rather the total time dedicated by this individual to carrying out all professional activities, research or otherwise, during or outside normal working hours. The percentage of full time set aside for the project should be estimated according to the definition of full time given above.” https://bit.ly/35AVDBK (projects FAQ)
    - “ A percentagem indicada em Equivalente a Tempo Integral deve ser a que resulta da subtração a 100% da percentagem dedicada ao ensino e a outras atividades que não sejam de I&D. “ https://bit.ly/2pY4jDa (2018 Research Unit evaluation guide).