

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

Panel Members

Morten Broberg (Chair)	University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Dimitry Kochenov	University of Groningen, Faculty of Law, The Netherlands
Elias Dinas	European University Institute, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Italy
Katerina Yiannibas	University of Deusto, Spain
Marina Aksenova	IE University, IE Law School, Spain
Mette Eilstrup-Sangiovanni	University of Cambridge, Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS), United Kingdom
Moira Faul	University of Geneva, GSEM, Geneva PPP Research Center, Switzerland
Olaf Corry	University of Copenhagen, Department of Political Science, Denmark
Paul James Cardwell	University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom
René Smits	University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

R&D Units

CEDIS - Centro de Investigação & Desenvolvimento sobre Direito e Sociedade (CEDIS)	Faculdade de Direito da Universidade Nova de Lisboa (FD/UNL)
Centro de Administração e Políticas Públicas (CAPP)	Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas (ISCS/ULisboa)
Centro de Estudos e Investigação em Direito (CEID-CRCFL)	Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP)
Centro de Estudos Internacionais (CEI-IUL)	ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
Centro de Estudos Jurídicos, Económicos e Ambientais (CEJEA)	Fundação Minerva - Cultura - Ensino e Investigação Científica (FMinerva)
Centro de Investigação de Direito Privado (CIDP)	Instituto de Direito Privado (IDP)
Centro de Investigação de Direito Público (CIDP)	Instituto de Ciências Jurídico-Políticas (ICJP)
Centro de Investigação do Instituto de Estudos Políticos (CIEP-UCP)	Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP)
Centro de Investigação em Ciência Política (CICP)	Universidade do Minho (UM)
Centro de Investigação em Direito Europeu Económico Financeiro e Fiscal (CIDEEFF)	Instituto de Direito Económico Financeiro e Fiscal da Faculdade de Direito de Lisboa (IDEFF)
Centro de Investigação em Direito Penal e Ciências Criminais (CIDPCC)	Instituto de Direito Penal e Ciências Criminais (IDPCC)
Centro de Investigação em Justiça e Governação (JusGov)	Universidade do Minho (UM)
Centro de Investigação em Política, Economia e Sociedade (CIPES)	COFAC, Cooperativa de Formação e Animação Cultural, CRL (COFAC)
Centro de Investigação Jurídico-Económica (CIJE)	Faculdade de Direito da Universidade do Porto (FD/UP)
Centro Lusíada de Investigação em Política Internacional e Segurança (CLIPIS)	Fundação Minerva - Cultura - Ensino e Investigação Científica (FMinerva)
ICPOL - Centro de Investigação do ISCP/ ICPOL	Polícia de Segurança Pública (PSP)
IJP - Instituto Jurídico Portucalense (IJP)	Universidade Portucalense Infante D. Henrique (UPIDH)
Instituto do Oriente (IO)	Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas (ISCS/ULisboa)
Instituto Jurídico da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra (IJ)	Universidade de Coimbra (UC)
Instituto Português de Relações Internacionais - Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (IPRI-NOVA)	Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas (FCSH/UNL)

Observatório de Relações Exteriores (OBSERVARE)	C.E.U. - Cooperativa de Ensino Universitário, C.R.L. (CEU)
RATIO LEGIS - Centro de Investigação e desenvolvimento em ciências Jurídicas (RATIO LEGIS)	C.E.U. - Cooperativa de Ensino Universitário, C.R.L. (CEU)
Teoria e História do Direito - Centro de Investigação da ULisboa (THD-ULisboa)	Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Lisboa (FD/ULisboa)

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: CEDIS - Centro de Investigação & Desenvolvimento sobre Direito e Sociedade (CEDIS)

Coordinator: Armando Manuel de Barros Serra Marques Guedes

Integrated PhD Researchers: 36

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 384 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 225 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEDIS is a R&D Centre which is no longer new, having existed for 15 years already, but which is still developing its research interests, its profile and its activities within the context of an institution that has an evidently strong commitment to the role of law in society. The commitment to the practical application of the law was underlined consistently during the visit as being part of the "DNA" of CEDIS, and the Panel could clearly see this in the way in which the Centre approaches its research and activities.

The activities undertaken by CEDIS are extremely wide-ranging and the Panel were impressed by their diversity and interdisciplinarity, from projects which apply in the (very) local context - Lisbon as a model city for the hearing-impaired community - to the international one, particularly towards Lusophone countries. It is evident that CEDIS has made its mark in the latter with publications relating to the general law of Portuguese-speaking countries. Whilst this type of activity fits the mould of what might be deemed "traditional" research, the Panel also noted the involvement and leadership of CEDIS in society-focussed research with a practical application. The role of CEDIS as a technical partner in the formation of academic exchanges in Africa was particularly noteworthy, especially as this formed a case study for one of the PhD researchers the Panel met. The Panel commends the team at CEDIS for their willingness to explore projects which may not fit the traditional models of research but which have tangible societal impact (whether in Portugal or overseas).

CEDIS has a particular point of view as a multi-disciplinary Centre, but lacks a clear narrative when explaining itself externally. Put simply, the Centre lacks an effective narrative for the compelling work they do. What CEDIS could and should explain more succinctly is that it does not simply add the optics of other disciplines to its legal work but rather approaches problems from different disciplines- this is a big difference and very innovative for a legal R&D Centre when executed faithfully. The overall strategy and organization of the research should showcase this multi-disciplinary framework as the core organizational structure rather than put forward thematic research lines. CEDIS spoke of an "artisanal production of research"- this should be considered further in light of the Centre's multi-disciplinary strengths. This could be a phenomenal model for a R&D Centre, but more work is needed on such a methodology/organization.

The publication record of CEDIS is relatively strong (publications submitted for assessment included encyclopaedia entries, commentaries to legislation and chapters in edited volumes), and there is a strong identity associated with the monographs published directly by CEDIS against the background of a challenging commercial environment in seeking publication by national/Portuguese-language publishing houses. The Centre also publishes its own peer review journal - Revista de Direito de L_ngua Portuguesa. Individual integrated researchers (such as J. Sarkin) have a record of high impact publications in top outlets. The Panel noted the publications included researchers at all levels within the Centre, and commends CEDIS for the clear commitment to involving its researchers (including those doing PhDs) in its publication strategies. This, the Panel felt, was a key aspect of inclusiveness and a contributor to career development of researchers.

CEDIS, as the main R&D Centre of the Faculty, incorporates a large number of the research-active staff in Law. The Panel noted the express support for CEDIS by the Faculty and its Dean. The Director of CEDIS has played a key role in forging its identity and encouraging its researchers – many of whom started their academic careers at NOVA. The Panel members were impressed with the strong interdisciplinary nature of the senior team, including some of the recent appointees, who have both extensive academic experience (often abroad) and careers which have not been focussed on Law. The Panel felt that this would enrich the research activities of the Centre and allow the broad range of activities to be underpinned by, for example, methodological approaches which push the boundaries of law. Despite the key role the Director has played in the success of CEDIS to date, the Panel felt that consideration should be given to allowing the next generation of researchers who are now at the senior level (but who might still be at a relatively early stage of their careers) to take a greater role in overall leadership. Some thought might be given to the longer-term strategic plan of CEDIS in the future, especially regarding its leadership. The Panel is aware that unfortunately it was not possible to meet the two members of the board who were ill on the day of the visit but was impressed by the members present and their grasp of both the opportunities and challenges available for CEDIS.

The Panel were equally impressed with the PhD researchers and how their work feeds into the Centre. Whilst the researchers who attended may not be a fully representative sample of the PhD community in CEDIS, the Panel noted that all were heavily involved in project work and whilst (for some) there was a cross-over between their project work and their theses topics, there was a risk of being too involved in the former, which might hamper their ability to complete their theses work in an appropriate time-frame. The Panel noted the gender balance in CEDIS at all levels and commend the Centre (and the Faculty, since CEDIS does not operate with separate legal personality) for its appointment of female scholars at all levels. The Panel found that the quality of the team of integrated researches merited a top rating.

The Panel also commends CEDIS for its success in gaining funding from a variety of sources, but not allowing the Centre to be simply focussed on obtaining funds without a strong research ethos underpinning it. The Panel felt that CEDIS promoted an environment of inclusiveness and involvement, with initiatives such as the weekly emailing promoting opportunities mentioned at different points by researchers at different levels. The Panel commends organisation of biweekly seminars allowing researchers from the Centre to discuss their ideas in the inclusive environment. The Panel noted some concerns about a lack of physical space for research in the building and would urge the institution to consider how to meet the needs of researchers in terms of physical space: this is especially important given the nature of some of the projects CEDIS is involved in which require large amounts of paperwork to store (possibly confidentially).

On internationalisation, CEDIS has positioned itself extremely well as a R&D Centre for law with expertise in the Lusophone world. There are evidently long-standing and deep relationships with institutions in Africa and Brazil, and the Panel noted the role CEDIS often plays as a 'bridge' between Europe and (in particular) Lusophone African countries. The Panel commends CEDIS for their commitment to scholarships, including involving students who are at the undergraduate and Master's degree level and who therefore might become the 'next generation' of researchers. The Panel felt that CEDIS should celebrate its expertise regarding these countries and whilst this does not prevent further involvement in internationalisation projects relating to elsewhere in Europe or the world, should not lose sight of the important continued role as a 'hub' for expertise in an international research environment.

Overall, the Panel felt that a very good rating for criterion A is merited. There is a clear commitment to international and – in particular – research that is relevant in society, both local and global. As the Centre develops, the Panel believe that the quality of publications produced by the integrated researchers will further improve in quality. It is recognised that in-house publications are a key plank of the strategy pursued by CEDIS, but the Panel strongly recommends that Integrated Researchers are encouraged to also publish in the best international, peer-reviewed journals and should not be afraid of attempting to do so. The Panel felt that CEDIS is right to continue to engage in a wide range of research activities across many different fields, but continuous attention should be paid to how to maintain the strengths of the Centre. Furthermore, in order to maintain a healthy work-life balance, the researchers in the Centre should be mindful about the risks of taking on too many projects – especially since over-stretching can have a negative impact on individual development (and personal health) and the ability of the Centre to continue its activities successfully.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Administração e Políticas Públicas (CAPP)

Coordinator: Paulo Alexandre do Nascimento Castro Seixas

Integrated PhD Researchers: 67

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 5

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1017 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 3

Programmatic Funding: 435 K€, including for 1 (Auxiliar) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

Some CAPP members have strong research output, with a series of publications in international peer-reviewed journals. Some of these journals are particularly selective and influential, such as PloS One, Review of Developments Economics and Social Science Research. Although there is significant variation in both quantity and quality of publications among members of the group, there seems to be consensus in terms of what the publication strategy of the group should be, with most members having at least one publication in international peer-reviewed journals. Publication incentives for the moment are mainly financial, but the intention is to trade teaching load with research production as well as to introduce awards for publications in certain areas of expertise. The topics vary substantively, not least because what unites the members of the Centre is social policy, which by definition extends to a wide array of themes and topics.

CAPP's members have been involved in several international research consortia, such as Competing Regional Integrations in Southeast Asia (funded by the European Commission), HEALTHDOX (Funded by NORFACE), Public Policies and Child Labour (Funded by the FCT), DECIDE (Funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland) and Restorative Justice at Post-Sentencing Level -Supporting and Protecting Victims (Funded by the European Commission). They have also become members in various international networks such as Evidently, these collaborations signal a positive attitude towards internationalization.

In addition to a strong publication record, there seems to be external recognition (both nationally and in some cases internationally) of the work done by at least the most active members of the group, another sign of outward-looking research attitude. There is also some internationalization in the members composing the group. CAPP seems to have attracted postdoc researchers from non-lusophone countries, such as Italy, Spain, and France.

CAPP plays an active role in national policy. The group has implemented various programs, including those on urban planning, gerontology, child health and poverty and multilevel governance in Portugal, which had profound implications in changing legislation and promoting policy both in Portugal and in other lusophone countries. They also serve on recruitment panels for senior public administration posts. In sum, their record in participating in or even leading projects with significant policy outcomes is rich. Proximity to decision makers is facilitated by both policy focus and the relationship into government. The UNESCO chair, recently achieved, is also another signal of internationalization in terms of policy impact. Impact is not only limited to executive policy suggestions. The happiness study suggests that there is at least some effort among the group to reach directly public opinion and civil society.

Given the heterogeneity in research interests among the members of the group, integration and consolidation of research agendas is undoubtedly a difficult task. To address this challenge, CAPP appears to have set in motion some potentially useful structures. First, the seminar series that takes place every two weeks will help to enhance interaction between the members. Second, the planning of a short specialization course in Public Policy Research, focusing primarily on CAPP researchers, will also contribute in strengthening ties between researchers and PhD students.

There are also signals of positive externalities. Membership in CAPP seems to facilitate individual members to take part in international research programmes. An example comes from Ana Esgaio, an affiliated member of the Centre, who due to this affiliation could participate in a project on green sustainability that led into an edited volume. By the same token, PhD students can reach more easily agreements to visit other universities as a result of their affiliation with CAPP.

Given the heterogeneity in research interests among the members of the group, integration and consolidation of research agendas is undoubtedly a difficult task. To address this challenge, CAPP appears to have set in motion some potentially useful structures. First, the seminar series that takes place every two weeks will help to enhance interaction between the members. Second, the planning of a short specialization course in Public Policy Research, focusing primarily on CAPP researchers, will also contribute in strengthening ties between researchers and PhD students.

There is also some internationalization in the members composing the group. CAPP seems to have attracted postdoc researchers from non-lusophone countries, such as Italy, Spain, and France. In general, despite some imbalances between members of the Unit, the overall quality of the group members is very high.

Suggestions for further integration of the research agendas seem promising, e.g. the research clusters that intend to operate as teams of continuous that integrate different ideas and maintain common research goals and values.

It is a good sign that the Unit recognizes the need for a scientific manager to consolidate the team and to make sure all members get access to external research and funding opportunities.

The steps towards more systematic and efficient dissemination of research activities, such as improvements in the website and the inauguration of newsletters, also seem to be on the right direction.

Recommendations:

We would like to conclude this report by providing some more critical points as well as some recommendations for further improvement:

- a) Our visit gave us the impression that although women are numerically adequately represented, some improvement might be still in play when it comes to their role in decision making processes.
- b) Although there are 68 PhD students integrated in the Centre, only three of them were present in the meeting. This was only indication of a more general pattern: far too many PhD students and unavoidably not all of them can be fruitfully incorporated within the Centre. There is ample room for consolidation in this area.
- c) Although the disparity in thematic areas is a logical consequence of the policy nature of the Centre, it might be useful to think of a more active policy to bring people of the Centre together more frequently, either via seminars or via other activities and events. Doing so would help to enhance the sense of belonging in the Centre and to strengthen its group identity.
- d) CAPP members need to be even more ambitious when it comes to publications. This is particularly the case for some senior members with few or no top publications in their research area.
- e) It may be also useful to enhance and deepen international research networks with other schools of public policy, such as Blavatnik, or the LSE School of Public Policy.
- f) It is vital to strengthen the position of the scientific management team, aiming at a wider dissemination of funding opportunities and research synergies across the members of the group.
- g) A more rigorous methods training for PhD student would be particularly useful.
- h) Keep track of the job placements of PhD students and whether these are in or outside academia. It will help to better allocate resources and meet needs more efficiently.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos e Investigação em Direito (CEID-CRCFL)

Coordinator: Rui Pedro Costa Melo Medeiros

Integrated PhD Researchers: 53

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 605 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 347 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

EID-CRCFL produced a solid impression on the Panel and is definitely on the way to achieving international prominence and recognition. The Panel found solid grounds to rate this Centre “very good”. It makes sense to start by outlining a significant irregularity in the application, which the Panel would like to flag upfront: the application mentioned (twice) that the Centre has been graded “excellent” in the course of the last assessment and this information is not correct, as the Panel was informed by the FCT. Although this kind of misinformation is unacceptable and raises ethical concerns, the Panel decided this matter should be considered as a stand-alone issue that is beyond its mandate. This issue has been separated from the scoring and further evaluation in this report.

The Centre is clearly fully integrated into the international research community. What produced a strong impression is the diversification of publications among the national and international venues (including publications in English and other foreign languages), clear emphasis on internationalization across the board, including the PhD students, who get, besides substantive guidance, also information about and financial support for participation in international research events. At home this inclusive approach is backed by “Católica Talks” and two new journals. Crucially, the Panel formed a clear opinion that the Centre has played a significant role in the advancement of the research culture, backed by the international PhD programme and a masterfully organized juggling of research between the two cities. The protocols of cooperation with major international institutions produce tangible results. The fact that applied research is not forgotten is of note, from engagement with Lusophone countries to the training of judges, Network of Legal Aid for Migrants and Refugees, Hand Up – protection of children in families and institutions legislative suggestions at national and European level _ very significant and notable outreach activities.

The research groups of the Centre include 1. Citizenship, Solidarity and Social Inclusion; 2. State Reform: Efficiency and Sustainability; 3. Global Challenges of European Integration; 4. See the Future – Sea, Environment and Natural Resources, and the Business Law Group. They work very well and are in many respects mutually complimentary, while boasting sufficient depth and backed by splendid research teams, which produces a very strong impression. This applies both to theoretical results and applied research as well as the dichotomy, observed by the Panel in context of all the R&D Centres it visited in the country, introducing balance between Portuguese-language Lusophone-focused research and the research outputs with global implications.

The Panel was very pleased with the serious treatment of the ethics part of the submission form, which has distinguished the Centre positively from a number of its peers.

CEID-CRCFL boasts a solid research team, which is well balanced in terms of gender and age, allowing younger scholars to shine, but lagging behind in terms of formally recognizing seniority. It is particularly surprising to see a brilliant Justice of the Constitutional Court, Gonçalo Almeida Ribeiro, who plays a significant role in the Centre, not to be recognized with a full professorship: listing a Justice as an Assistant Professor would not be possible in any of the systems of higher education the Panel members heed from. The mix of nationalities at the senior level leaves much to be desired, but is much better among the PhD students. The English-language programme unquestionably helps in this regard.

Plans for the future are realistic and well-articulated. The Panel was satisfied that the Centre will be fully able to achieve the projected results. Building on the strengths of the team and the research approach chosen, cooperation with numerous institutions worldwide, as well as synergies with the Católica Global School of Law, paint an optimistic picture of the future. The Panel is convinced that the Centre has significant room for growth and improvement, notwithstanding the heights already achieved. Of particular note are the interdisciplinary aspirations of the Centre, connecting law with technology, psychology and economics. For all the research groups/lines outlined the future is bright, should the plans articulated in the documents reviewed by the Panel be fulfilled.

What produced a weak impression is the selection of venues for the publication of research: for future growth, the Centre could be more selective in terms of the publishers and journals to ensure that more prominent venues are considered. Peter Lang, Hart and Kluwer, put by the Centre in one line in the application, are very far from being equally prestigious and impactful and the understanding of this should inform the Centre future publishing decisions.

The Centre could do much more to attract major international funding, given that they managed to build a solid profile. Not participating in Horizon2020 consortia and other similar bids appears to be a lost opportunity, given the growing research profile of the Centre.

The Panel awarded funding to all the Units ranked overall "excellent" and "very good".

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos Internacionais (CEI-IUL)

Coordinator: Luís Nuno Valdez Faria Rodrigues

Integrated PhD Researchers: 54

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 633 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 385 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEI-IUL is an R&D Unit with a strong academic profile, with some very good publications and a clear opening towards a more international outlook. The Unit has a clear strategy and self-understanding of what excellence looks like, beyond a singular focus on mainstream approaches and Anglo-spheric journal publications. Their definition of excellence suffuses the work and projects they undertake and the publications and social impact activities through which they contribute. Within Portugal the Unit is a point of reference for those working on Area Studies. Area studies are always difficult to consolidate, but the whole Centre appears to take the challenges seriously and work well together to develop the previous AfricanR&D Centre.

Africa is clearly the main theme and pillar, but with extensions to other parts of the world, most evidently Latin America. Moving beyond conventional Area Studies research on one geographical region, the CEI-IUL has extended into addressing issues using methodologies and theories in Political Science and International Relations, at the same time as usefully bringing insights from their anthropological and Area Studies expertise to bear on Political Science questions. The Centre has successfully used opportunities for partnership in teaching and public outreach on the summer programme. The Centre displays some excellent examples of strategic exploitation of synergies between research, teaching and outreach activities, such as the summer schools, or particularly the Activisms in Africa project, where the lead researcher built partnerships to organise an impressive series of workshops, a conference and then a summer school and public outreach programme of films. CEI-IUL researchers make useful contributions to research in gender and conflict, and, in the SSE research, bridging across to African Studies thus complementing the much greater volume of SSE research available on Latin America. The methodological interdisciplinarity that different researchers bring to the Unit appears to be appreciated across all levels of seniority, and especially among the very satisfied PhD students that we met.

The evaluators noted an increase in outputs in international highly ranked journals. While we saw relatively few journal articles or research monographs of international quality, some Lusophone articles appear to have potential quality. However, the Unit output is not yet commensurate with a large integrated staff. These publications are a good basis for further internationalisation of activities and dissemination of results. However the quality of the journals is not always what it could be. Researchers should be encouraged to aim higher. Less prominence should be given to in-house or 'NATO'-style publishing outlets. The CEI-IUL in-house journal, Caderno de Estudos Africanos has a high impact factor. However, more focus on publishing in international and quality outlets would lift this engaged group of people higher in academic terms without compromising the broad patterns of engagement with civil society and across multiple continents and countries. While there is some imbalance in research outputs, there is a clear forward momentum towards publication in more high quality international and national journals.

The Unit has a strategy for supporting its researchers in publishing in higher visibility venues, providing training and guidance on how and where to publish, including providing early feedback to researchers in the monthly Café dos Investigadores. In addition, the Unit provides support structures, such as rewarding publications in higher impact journals with an additional month of salary, or English language support with translation and editing. The possibility of

buying researchers out of teaching rather than cash prizes was felt to hold more potential in supporting publications, but this strategy is not in the gift of the Centre, but the Faculty.

The Unit is strong on relevance and engagement with national government, international organisations, and civil society, revealing good outreach and dissemination as well as engagement in social change strategies. The focus on women's rights, radicalisation, environment, and engagement with NGOs and Portuguese and European institutions are all examples of a relevant and forward-looking research agenda. The Unit researchers are actively engaged in giving advice to social movements, NGOs and municipalities, as well as having a certain media presence. They continue their meaningful outreach and engagement with civil society, the military, and most recently to schools. The Unit therefore appears to be strong on social impact, both individually, and also as a group. The Centre has successfully undertaken major national science dissemination activities such as Noite das Ciencias, as well as leadership of projects with direct social relevance such as sports transparency. The relevance of their research and outreach to society is exemplified in the mobilisation of the research team working on female genital mutilation (FGM) to advise in the development of interventions in gender-based violence (GBV) in Portugal.

There is clear evidence of a highly relevant R&D activities focused on issues that are outward looking and allow researchers to develop professional contacts beyond Portugal. The Unit should focus on deepening internationalization through developing standing exchange relationship with R&D Units/departments abroad, as opposed to arranging lots of one-off conferences.

The Centre has a well-diversified portfolio of funders with a promising increase in international research funding year on year, but large drop in national project funding. The Unit is very active in seeking extra funding and in international collaborations, and has a strong track record in securing funding from other sources.

The Unit provides a venue for areas studies. Scholars need to engage with each other and broader debates in International Relations, bringing local knowledges and insights to bear on wider international impacts. The team is dominated by Portuguese nationals, with certain individuals from outside of Portugal. The gender balance among researchers has improved, but could be better, particularly in more senior positions. Whatever the proportions of gender representation, the dynamics in the site visit clarified that female colleagues participate actively and are heard by their male and female colleagues.

This research group has strong points and is highly relevant in multiple ways, but still has a minority who apparently are not publishing in academic outlets. There appears to be a core group that is more productive, but there was a wider group of more 'peripheral' researchers whose role and level of engagement in the Unit was less clear. If these are contributing in other 'good citizenry' ways, then this should be documented elsewhere and used to justify lack of publications in good outlets.

The team expertise cuts across many disciplines, and this multi-disciplinarity is held to be a strength of the Unit, and plurality appears to be encouraged as a reflection of the issues and social needs served by the Unit research. The Centre researchers show an interesting range of perspectives, theories and methods, and cover a broad range of research topics from democracy to extractives, football to gender, and security to social-solidarity economy without stretching themselves too thin (currently). Across all levels of the Unit team, the evaluators noted a positive atmosphere in this dynamic group, with a PhD team that appeared fully integrated in the Unit activities.

Specifically, the research and outreach activities of Ana Margarida Esteves on social-solidarity economy show her strong contribution, first to international scholarship on the opportunities offered by Social and Solidarity Economy, popular education, local development and participatory democracy; secondly, to issues of public concern and methods of involving local communities; and finally to the CEI-IUL itself. Her invitation to speak at the UN Research Institute for Social Development is testament to her international impact and relevance.

The planning reported appears strong, with some necessary flexibility built in. The Unit has capitalised well on FCT funding to attract early career researchers and to catalyse more funding sources. In a difficult funding environment, the Unit makes good attempts to counteract lack of stability in funding by fielding strong applications taking advantage of the research management support in-house. However, there is still a split between integrated researchers who enjoy stable contracts but less time for research, and on the other hand the instability and precarity associated with research-only contracts.

The Centre plans to consolidate and expand its international partnerships; it would be useful to clarify specifically how such partners will support their research, both existing and planned.

The Unit plans to extend their Portugal-Brazil research to a broader Latin American research strand, and to strengthen their MENA research under the leadership of a recognised researcher. It would be useful to understand the rationale behind expansion over consolidation, given their already wide range. The Unit has successfully expanded from an African Studies institute to become more relevant to Political Science and International Relations conversations, without losing their unique contribution. At this stage of the Unit development it may be more prudent to consolidate institutional and organisational substance and reputation rather than continuing to expand into new areas and research topics. The Unit plans to expand issue areas to include MENA and Latin America to an already vast regional portfolio seems poorly justified when there is already a wide focus: would this not just lead to being spread too thinly?

The thematic and organisation of future planned research streams seem appropriate and feasible in light of previous activities. The ambition of enlarging the group of researchers by hiring three new integrated researchers per year over the next 4 years seems reasonable, although it would be useful to have a clearer sense of where particularly these researchers will be integrated (i.e. which specific part of the ongoing research agenda will be strengthened?) How does the Unit propose to achieve the goal of attracting and integrating more foreign researchers? Again, the plans to boost international publications are the right direction, but the Unit has not been clear on how they will do this. Overall, the strategies to achieve the goals including boosting publication quantity and quality to achieve international reference-level seem to be somewhat lacking in detail and specificity.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos Jurídicos, Económicos e Ambientais (CEJEA)

Coordinator: Manuel Carlos Lopes Porto

Integrated PhD Researchers: 31

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 316 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEJEA (Centre for Legal, Economic, and Environmental Studies) has been established to promote and disseminate research in the areas of law, economics, and environmental studies. In addition to pursuing its own projects, CEJEA collaborates on projects with researchers from other universities and centres in Portugal and abroad.

In the period from 2013 to 2017 CEJEA was organised in five groups covering (i) transnational public law, (ii) Portuguese constitutional history, (iii) criminal law and criminology, (iv) taxation as a way to achieve environmental targets, and (v) enforcement of intellectual property rights. In the period from 2018 to 2022 CEJEA will cover four areas, namely (1) constitutional history and challenges of transnational constitutionalism, (2) law and economics of contracts, private and public contracts; (3) law and economics of regulation and (4) challenges of the "risk" society.

The application covers 31 Integrated PhD Researchers.

The applicant lists ten main publications in 2013-2017 authored by Integrated Researchers. The first is a 12-page contribution in English published in *The Routledge International Handbook of Forensic Intelligence and Criminology* (AGRA, C. ndido da (2018) *Criminology and forensic science: historical developments and epistemological approach*. In ROSSY, Quentin, ed. [et al] *The Routledge international handbook of forensic intelligence and criminology* [Em linha] Abingdon; New York:Routledge¹), whereas the remaining nine are in Portuguese. The Panel does not doubt that several of those publications that have been written in Portuguese have an impact within the Lusophone world as well as in the Italian and Spanish speaking-world and therefore goes well beyond the Portuguese borders. At the same time, the choice of primarily Portuguese language publications necessarily means that the publications will not be accessible to those parts of the research community that do not read Portuguese. Moreover, the volume of the publications also appeared somewhat limited in comparison to the number of integrated researchers. An internationalisation strategy that does not incorporate the pursuit of publications in languages other than Portuguese is likely to be rather limited in scope and impact in the wider world. The Panel appreciated the challenges of writing in a different language (both in a technical sense and as according to national cultural norms) and was impressed with the level of English spoken by the researchers present at the site-visit.

At the site-visit the Panel expressly addressed the issue of the researchers international outreach and it became clear that several members of the R&D Unit are also interacting with the non-Portuguese speaking research community. This was for example the case in the fields of law and biotechnology. Equally during the site-visit, the Panel raised specific questions regarding four areas of research that had been singled out by the R&D Unit in addition, namely: (1) The subsidiarity principle, (2) equality and non discrimination in the labour market, (3) security and trust in the tax system, and (4) conflicts between trademarks, designations of origin and geographical indications. The ensuing presentations and discussions convincingly showed to the Panel that the R&D Unit clearly is producing very relevant research in a national context and in certain areas also does so in an international perspective.

Moreover, the Panel acknowledged that CEJEA produces a positive impact on Portuguese society.

¹ WWW: e-ISBN 978-1-315-54194-5 pp. 18-29

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781134888955/chapters/10.4324%2F9781315541945-2>

Taking all issues into account, the Panel had no doubt that CEJEA deserved being rated as Good. The Panel did not believe that a higher rating could be awarded due to the limitations of the scientific knowledge produced within the Centre during the past five years under examination.

During the site-visit interaction with the Integrated Researchers of the R&D Unit, the Panel found that a number of these members have earlier careers as high-ranking politicians. In the opinion of the Panel, these Integrated Researchers can provide valuable insights that all members of the Unit may benefit from. The Panel considers this to be an important asset that should be upheld in the future. Similarly, the Panel found that some of the younger researchers displayed high quality. It is important to note, however, that the Panel was evaluating works undertaken within the past 5 years, even though for some of the Centre members their respective knowledge and experience stretches beyond this period.

The Panel had no doubt that overall the team of Integrated Researchers were Good.

The plans for the future generally appeared sound, but the Panel had difficulties fully understanding how the different research areas would generate synergies between the different strands of research. There was also a lack of a clear understanding about a research and publication strategy that allows the Centre members to take their research to a higher level. As some of the senior members of the Centre have extensive professional experience, but not necessarily academic experience (in terms of the type of research that this FCT Panel are asked to evaluate), more careful attention needs to be paid to ensure that the nature of “outputs” are fully understood. In concrete terms, newspaper articles and other media appearances are certainly valid means of increasing the visibility of the Centre, whereas they are not a substitute for peer-reviewed publications in national or international journals, which is the type of research the Panel believes the Centre should aim for.

Also, the Panel was surprised that the R&D Unit in the section on ethical issues argued “that ethical issues do not arise with the development and with the implications of the program of CEJEA”. In particular, the Panel would have welcomed that the R&D Unit had addressed possible ethical questions relating to questions of law and biotechnology as well as questions relating to GDPR.

Overall, the Panel found that the proposed plans for the period 2018-2022 were Good.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação de Direito Privado (CIDP)

Coordinator: António Manuel da Rocha e Menezes Cordeiro

Integrated PhD Researchers: 36

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

One of the greatest strengths of the Lisbon Centre for Research in Private Law (CIDP or Centre) was the selection of prospective research areas for the 2018-2022 plan of activities. CIDP has identified highly relevant areas that merit further scientific research. The Panel was most impressed with some of the future projects and research areas of CIDP; namely, those related to recent EU legislative and policy initiatives (EU Regulation General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), European Pillar of Social Rights, EU Regulation 2015/848 on insolvency proceedings), international collective bargaining, online alternative dispute resolution (ADR), start-up financing, crowdfunding and banking law, the sharing economy, artificial intelligence and the further work of the Centre in the area of FinTech. One concern however of the Panel regarding future projects was that the research outputs were not well defined. There was a heavy emphasis on scientific meetings, teaching of master courses and events but with almost no mention of the staff involved beyond the senior researchers or the prospects concerning internationally significant publications that go beyond compilation volumes on conference proceedings.

The Panel noted that a number of Integrated Researchers have produced relevant national scholarship, but that there was a more limited scope of international scholarship. Some of those whom the Panel identified as key contributors to the Centre research output were not able to attend the meeting, leaving the Panel without the opportunity to speak with them so as to evaluate the extent of their involvement with the Centre. While the Panel agreed that the merit of the team of Integrated researchers was sufficient to merit a rating of good (3) for Criterion B, it was not clear to what degree of the merit of the team could be attributed to CIDP and to what extent the grand strategy adopted by the Centre actually furthered their core scientific production and research.

The Panel commends the advanced training activities of the Centre. While the Panel acknowledges the merit and importance of advanced training, the Panel focused its assessment of Criterion A mostly on the quality, merit, relevance and internationalisation of research outputs in the period 2014-2107. Training and scientific meetings seemed to the Panel to be both the core and the bulk of the CIDP activity during the last period. The Panel noted the important platforms such meetings and courses present (visibility of research, an opportunity for students to present, advanced training) and moreover, was impressed with the high level of participation (7000+ persons in the last period). The concern of the Panel is that the Centre did not evidence a clear and adhered to strategy for high-quality scientific analysis in peer-reviewed journals, especially internationally. During the site visit, the Panel noted some confusion in the presentation of scientific results, which cited social media data ("Scientific Results in Numbers").

One of the main concerns of the Panel was the lack of a defined strategy for internationalization. The Panel recognized the work of the Centre in Lusophony, but recommends that an expanded view of internationalization be adopted. CIDP recognized the need to develop a strategy concerning publications in languages other than Portuguese, suggesting that there was not a pre-existing strategy, though some Centre members have done so. Moreover, scientific meetings appear to run in Portuguese, and on some occasions with English translations of the publications. As concerning technical language support, the Panel noted the CIDP initiative to promote the Faculty of Law protocols concerning course offerings in English as well as the future hiring of translators.

The Centre publishes five journals, two specialising on Brazilian law, and the vast majority of the articles are in Portuguese. The collective works are also in Portuguese, though conference proceedings (such as on Maritime Law in 2015) include contributions made in the original language. Of concern to the Panel was that 70% of the journal content (as estimated by one of the senior researchers at the meeting) is by members associated with the Centre (including the

best dissertations of LL.M. students), with the remainder usually coming from scholars at partner institutions. The Panel is also concerned with the high number of in-house journals, particularly in regards to the consumption of time and resources of the research team.

As considering ethics, it was of concern to the Panel that this section of the application was left blank. During the site visit, there was a reference made to relevant research principles and as well as to the University of Lisbon Faculty of Law policy on ethics, but there was a lack of consideration of Centre-wide ethics consideration despite work ongoing on subjects including GDPR, which have specific ethical obligations. Moving forward, the Panel recommends that the role of ethics be given more consideration in research planning and implementation.

As concerning gender balance, the Panel recognizes that there have been moves toward ensuring gender parity, but that further thought should be given to gender balance at the senior level. As concerning work/life balance, the Panel noted the important role of the Centre allocation of scholarships to doctoral students to lessen the burden of professional work commitments.

As concerning the organizational structure, the Panel noted the doctoral students and junior researchers appreciation of the opportunity to generate research ideas within CIDP. Regular meetings provide opportunities for more horizontal organization of idea generation despite the vertical hierarchy of the CIDP structure. The Panel commends this collegiality and would recommend the further integration of doctoral students and junior researchers in research planning, implementation and publication.

Overall, this a Centre that has some important tools in place to become a competitive R&D Unit: a growing, specialized library on private law (2500+ volumes), a wide network of diverse stakeholders and most importantly, a commitment to cutting-edge research in private law. What is needed going forward is a defined strategy so as to become an international reference in research.

In summary, the recommendations of the Panel are as follows:

- To develop a publication strategy that optimizes impact both nationally and internationally.
- To provide more guidance concerning publication strategy to junior researchers and doctoral students.
- To develop the connection between scientific meetings and quality publication in peer-reviewed journals.
- To further consider and broaden the internalization strategy.
- To encourage and facilitate more publication in English and foreign languages.
- To analyse the cost and benefits of multiple in-house publications.
- To achieve more gender balance at the senior level.
- To consider the specific ethical considerations of the distinct research areas.
- To further the integration of doctoral students and junior researchers in research planning, implementation and publication.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação de Direito Público (CIDP)

Coordinator: Carlos Manuel de Almeida Blanco de Morais

Integrated PhD Researchers: 39

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 5

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 368 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 13

Programmatic Funding: 1120 K€, including for 3 (2 Junior, 1 Auxiliar) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CIDP provides a clear example of a superbly run, fully internationalized high-quality R&D Centre of globally competitive quality boasting an able hard working team and a clear vision of the future. The Panel was deeply impressed by the Centre significant achievements on all counts and unanimously rated it overall “Excellent”, as well as “excellent” on all individual sub-criteria. It is the only legal R&D Centre in the country to have achieved this score in this evaluation round, as it is significantly ahead of all the peers on all the FCT evaluation criteria: a model for all the others to follow and to learn from.

The publication track-record nationally and internationally that CIDP managed to achieve puts it en par with the top peers around the world. Publications in legendary outlets shaping respective fields, such as *Ratio Juris*, *European Constitutional Law Review*, *European Public Law*, *Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht* and others, as well as book chapters with core international publishers in the volumes edited by the global leaders in different sub-fields of public law are a significant marker of top quality. The national research scene is not forgotten either: the output is solid and the Centre journal is running very well. Besides, an agreement with Almedina has been signed to showcase Portuguese-language work.

Crucially, notwithstanding the superb amount of leading publications and a clear track-record of globally significant research of primary importance, the Centre boasts a full understanding of the basic tenet that a research facility should continuously improve – precisely what they have now achieved since the last assessment, when the Centre was ranked “very good”. Given the clarity of CIDP objectives (presented in a delightfully clear and insightful way during the Panel visit) and the worked out understanding of how to get there, the Centre is on the rise. It has not yet reached the peak of its performance. Established in 2012 (similar to the inception dates of a number of other R&D Units), the CIDP has progressed at lightning speed compared with the peers: its inclusive governance structure is as crystal clear as it is working in practice to empower researchers to perform at the top-quality international level. The splendid team of highly motivated researchers is balanced in terms of age and gender and boasts significant international experience. Research leadership and planning is crisp and well-articulated to bring about superb results fast.

The core aspect of CIDP's effective internationalization strategy is stimulating a surge in peer reviewed academic journal publishing. CIDP has external sources of funding (more than half a million euros for the consulting projects alone over the review period), which then is invested in much needed technical language and research management support _ an investment that has paid back. Crucially, while raising money, the Centre does not follow the money: the lines of research are solidly defined and getting contracts in is not the core task, which shows in the stellar publications. The Panel was particularly impressed by the Centre policy to use the royalties from the books it published to give awards to the most promising young researchers for research stays at the key institutions abroad. This is a significant difference with other Centres publishing their research in-house and spending, rather than making money on the dissemination of their results. The Centre links with outstanding universities such as EUI, FGV etc. are impressive and deserve a mention. Importantly, the Centre also cooperates with other R&D Units in Portugal (eg. CEDIS). Cooperation has acquired extra added value due to its stimulating interdisciplinary character.

Both core priorities of the Centre – to remain a reference in Portugal and to enjoy a clear international presence – have been unanimously judged by the Panel to have been abundantly fulfilled.

The team of top scholars at different stages of their careers that the Centre assembled is well-calibrated in terms of gender balance and intergenerational continuity. Further improvements on this count are part of the Centre strategy, despite the fact that women make up 43% of the Integrated Researchers. Some researchers have reached agreements with the Faculty to consolidate their teaching in one semester but the general sentiment in the room is that most conduct their research at night and on the weekends. When asked about work/life balance, the CIDP mentioned that there is full legal compliance but the general tone is "manageable but not without sacrifice". The superb results the Centre demonstrated prove that the top team is working well.

CIDP identified that they need staff to support research activities, as well as positions created exclusively for research – as there are currently no full-time researchers in the Centre, which puts its academic output in an even more remarkable light – and needs to create partnerships with the NGO and the third sector. They are working to acquire more public funding and to fight the culture of individual research in law.

As to foreign talent, the concern (which has been echoed by a number of R&D Units) is that salaries in Portugal do not attract foreign academics. The Panel recommended that the R&D Unit seek to attract foreign researchers with sizeable foreign grants (e.g. Marie Curie, Horizon2020 and others). The research track-record of the Centre makes attracting such funding a clear possibility. CIDP explained, however, that there is an administrative issue in that the University of Lisbon handles such applications – an agreement with the University will have to be reached to directly attract such scholars to the CIDP. The Centre has clear objectives along the lines of the proposed research with specific conferences already planned (as soon as November 2018), which is a good indicator of the direction of the Centre.

The Centre has a clear view of the problems faced by Portuguese academia, for instance teaching primarily in Portuguese and a disproportional emphasis on Portuguese in PhD training. The Centre introduces classes in English to attract both foreign students and foreign researchers.

The needs are clear: the doctoral students mentioned the need for more administrative support and technical language support, this could be accomplished with a staff hire (e.g. translator) or it was mentioned by one researcher, with connection to undergraduate students so that they could also be exposed to research. Clearly the lack of administrative staff is an issue across all R&D Units and this was the most referenced concern and request.

What concerns the value added by CIDP for the Integrated Researchers, the Centre facilitates work and collaborations internationally, access to non-published works/works in progress, redirection and expansion of individual research areas and networks, and more proactive guidance for junior researchers. The senior researchers spoke of working to combine their personal networks with that of CIDP and involving junior researchers directly in their work and overall, enhances the international dimension of their work; specifically, by placing and connecting individual research in international networks.

As concerning particularly impressive scholars, the Panel got an impression that CIDP boasted a hugely competitive team of top scholars, each able to make a significant contribution in its own right. This being said, Tiago Fidalgo de Freitas, a PhD student and one of the leaders of the Centre, was very impressive and an obvious talent of outstanding quality.

The main cited concern on which all the cohorts of the top-level scholars at the Centre could fully converge was the red tape of the FCT. The forms were cited as ineffective and unnecessarily cumbersome. Also cumbersome is the ability to have questions answered without having to go through various channels/forms. Answers given are frequently unsatisfactory. These observations are fully in line with the Panel own information about FCT: the country research climate will definitely improve if the FCT changed its ways.

As the Centre puts its future strategy until 2022 into operation, the Panel recommends that the Centre external advisors (and other external advisors beyond Portugal) are regularly consulted to ensure that it remains on track to meet its goals. This is particularly important given the changing nature of academia and legal scholarship in Europe and worldwide, and will ensure that the Centre maintains its commitment to excellence.

The Unit, which is the only Unit in Law in the country to be awarded an all-star 5-5-5 'excellent' rating asked for 26 PhD scholarships in the application. Given the limitations of this FCT Program, the Panel was bound to grant half of what was

asked for. All the other R&D Centres in the country get significantly less PhD fellowships awarded, which is a direct reflection of their lower score. CIDP is such a marvellous Centre, that the Panel was satisfied that awarding as many PhD places as they asked for would be great.

Given that the need for more granting and research support has been mentioned during the visit, the Panel has decided, besides awarding two post-docs, to award funding also for a full-time assistant of this kind.

Given that this Centre is by far the best among all the R&D Units the Panel has evaluated in law, the Panel decided to award the Programmatic Funding the Centre requested in the application in full.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação do Instituto de Estudos Políticos (CIEP-UCP)

Coordinator: André Azevedo Alves

Integrated PhD Researchers: 20

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 188 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 1

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEIP-UCP pursues research activities broadly oriented towards international political issues. Due to the history of the Center, history of political thought and international political theory has a profile among a section of the researchers, but a more contemporary and policy oriented comparative and international security agenda is also pursued through various projects. Particularly the newer strands of research in the fields of security and defence studies appear to be partly chosen “outside-in” through success in securing funding and external partners such as NATO. There appears to be an emphasis on political thought and networks emphasizing freedom and personal responsibility as well as some work directed to the role of faith, e.g. in education. Originally a teaching unit, the Centre is aiming to become more squarely focused on and driven by research agendas. At the same time external engagement and collaborations remain a priority for the Center and teaching loads are heavy for most researchers.

CEIP-UCP has been a reference point nationally in certain areas of security and defence policy during the period, but efforts are being made to attract international talent and to nurture existing researchers to publish more including internationally. There are measures designed to create a stimulating academic environment via in-house seminars for improvement of work in progress, and pragmatic leadership that allow prioritization of time for research, e.g. reorganizing teaching schedules where possible (although this has to be balance against inconvenience for students). A Horizon 2020 application has recently been supported, and researchers generally speak of financial support for international travel, for the purpose of paper presentation and networking.

A number of interesting English language publications have been added to the Center profile with the recruitment of scholars trained abroad leading to publications in outlets such as Philosophy and European Journal of Philosophy (Hasselberger). Other noteworthy publications include an article in Political Studies (Alves), one in Journal of Business Ethics, a monograph published with Routledge (Espada), a co-edited book published with Palgrave (Dias). A book on the Salamanca School was published in 2013 (but originally came out 2010). Some researchers e.g. Carlos Almeida and Sonia Ribeiro are productive in Portuguese language outlets, and some of this could have wider relevance in and beyond a lusophone context and/or beyond if it is translated and made available.

However, while some rigorous and original work has been done during the period, several researchers work is either insubstantial in terms of leading to peer reviewed publications or is going into outlets with limited international reach such as published book chapters in non-international publishers and into non-indexed or very low impact journals. Even within its chosen area of specialization, the level and consistency of international research output is not yet commensurate with being an international reference nor with what might be expected given the number of people working at the Center and the overall level of funding. Despite having PhDs from recognized educational institutions abroad, and the existence of a number of potentially productive research collaborations, most of the output is selectively or nationally oriented. Other English language outlets in which integrated researchers have published include Independent Review and Heythrop Journal and though these are peer reviewed neither is high impact or central to the thematic focus of the Center. Surprisingly few of the quality publications highlighted fall within the core international security-focus of the Center.

Some material published in 2018 looks promising and the leadership should continue to encourage researchers to at least expose their work to international peer review process as a minimum, before resorting to publishing in domestic outlets and non-peer reviewed books and journals. The use of in-house publishers should be discouraged.

In terms of relevance to society, the Center has made multiple contacts with external partner including NATO public diplomacy division and the European Commission, and there is a tradition of military and strategic personnel collaborating with and becoming researchers in the Center, e.g. there are joint ventures with the local War College concerning south Atlantic security issues. There is also engagement from a peace studies angle involving stakeholders of a more varied nature including school children, as well as in relation to selected geographical foci such as Cape Verde. Brazil is a natural point of reference too, and has potential to contribute to the Center relevance, especially if this becomes part of a coordinated research effort. The Center has a national brand as a reference point for commentary on security and is regularly contacted by the media for expert opinion.

The challenge is to ensure that such contacts and the many collaborations add to rather than distract from producing relevant knowledge and disseminating quality research results. While the Center has been able to generate funds from external sources, some of these come with commitments that may not always be conducive to enhancing a coherent research agenda. It is positive, but could also be telling in this regard, that the Center was recently ranked well as a think-tank. Efforts should be made to ensure that ongoing and future collaborations are driven by a coherent research agenda rather than simply by opportunities on an ad hoc basis. Commentary and impact on society should in the end be rooted in rigorous and ideally internationally engaged research activities.

The Center has increased its number of Integrated Researchers (from 16 to 27), though only marginally over the period when it comes to Integrated Researchers holding PhDs (from 16 to 20). The number of PhD candidates supervised by Integrated Researchers has almost doubled and is now high in relation to the supervision capacity of the team. There are a number of researchers with PhDs from abroad, and the addition of Integrated Researchers returning to Portugal or being attracted to Lisbon has recently added to this effort, boding well for the future of the internationalization effort. One obvious positive addition during the period is William Hasselberger whose work appears consistently in international outlets and fits well into the intellectual tradition of the Centre.

The leadership seemed surprisingly impressionistic about the ongoing research projects although it is a relatively small group. The gender balance is fair, especially at junior researcher level, although the leadership and the integrated PhDs are still predominantly male. Military personnel may tend to be male and in the more senior category, but efforts could be made to redress this imbalance.

The Center aspires to an interdisciplinary approach, though this tends to be from closely related disciplines, e.g. Sea Studies is being pursued by researchers specialising in law, political science and International Relations. The political theory and intellectual history stream is not always obviously related to the more policy-oriented defence and international security work. An agreement with the Faculty of Science that combines chemistry and biology with IR is on the cards.

PhD students at the Center were in most cases integrated into the research projects with more senior researchers, although a typical difference concerns whether doctoral theses are set up as part of ongoing larger projects or solo academic ventures. Money was made available for conference and workshop attendance, although none we met had been to the larger international conferences such as International Studies Association annual convention or European International Studies Association.

It is positive that the leadership is explicit about the goal of internationalization and recognizes that more progress is still required concerning research, publishing and dissemination in this regard. The plans for six visiting researchers or consultants per year are overall sensible, although the equal weight given to consultants does not chime with the plans to pivot more firmly towards academic research. The plans involving continuing on-going measures such as regular research seminars, organizing a range of lectures and conferences, including the Estoril Political Forum are overall sensible. The EPF will allow staff, students and graduate students to present and discuss ongoing work in collaboration with certain "Euro-american networks", in particular with several internationally recognized institutions.

There is however an issue with the focus of the plans going forward. There are already multiple research foci and some seem only partially aligned with each other. The focus on certain political philosophies, e.g. the Estoril Political Forum dedicated specifically to ideas about "liberty and personal responsibility", combined with faith-oriented collaborations with other Catholic institutions (e.g. in Africa) and projects such as participation in the "Faith in Work" network raises a question about how this chimes with the focus on international security and defence. Also the leadership should as a

faith-based institution be mindful of how it safeguards genuine pluralism in the Center and of course the intellectual freedom of its researchers.

The plan to have two new research fellowships and two PhD stipends and for these to contribute to the interdisciplinarity of the Centre would potentially require clearer plans for research and PhD community building. The plans for administrative support and funds to support publications seem justified.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Ciência Política (CICP)

Coordinator: Miguel Angelo Vilela Rodrigues

Integrated PhD Researchers: 34

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 5

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 566 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 440 K€, including for 2 (1 Junior, 1 Auxiliar) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Panel finds that both the volume and quality of the research outputs produced during period 2013-2017 by researchers integrated at CICP (and listed in the current application) are of a high standard. We are here referring not merely to the research outputs listed by the R&D Unit in the first part of the application, but also to other publications listed on individual researchers Orchid profiles. A good proportion of these publications are written in English and published in high-ranked international, peer-reviewed journals, some of which are at the top end of their (sub)fields (such as, for example, the Journal of Common Market Studies and Public Management Review). We also note a large number of non-English publications by members of CICP which are aimed at policy-makers and academic audiences beyond Portugal (that is, in other lusophone countries) thus adding a further element of internationalization to the Centre's research activities. Thus we feel that the criterion of producing and disseminating research of a high international standard has been met.

In addition to increasing output in peer-reviewed international journals, there is also clear evidence that the research outputs produced by CICP are of relevance to public policy and society at large. One example is the project on the Municipal Transparency Index, which focuses on improving levels of transparency and responsiveness towards citizens. Other examples include the publication of two yearbooks providing financial information of municipalities and the state-owned enterprises in Portugal, as well as the policy report on Catalonia's right to Self-determination, commissioned by the Catalan Generalitat. Both projects are indicative of a clear focus on producing publicly useful and socially relevant research, and both projects demonstrate that the CICP is a national reference point for public policy.

Finally, there is also clear evidence of wider international recognition of some members of the research group, as evidenced by their participation in joint research projects such as the Social Media for Digital Democracy in collaboration with the UN University and invitations to foreign universities to take up visiting posts.

CICP is making a clear contribution of advanced training (at the PhD and postdoc level) both through its doctoral training programs and its summer schools, which not only add to a stimulating intellectual environment for researchers and students integrated in the Centre, but also provide a further element of internationalization through the participation of foreign scholars and scholars. During the site visit, students expressed a high level of satisfaction with the teaching and supervision they receive as members of CICP, and mentioned a number of different ways in which they feel they are integrated into the Centre research activities, including being given a voice in setting the agenda for research seminars and planning of other joint research activities.

CICP produces an in-house journal, *Perspectivas*. The Panel was initially sceptical about the value of this journal and asked CICP to carefully assess the balance between the time and effort required to produce a journal and the limited benefits that accrue. However, it became clear from the discussion that CICP sees *Perspectivas* as an important tool for integrating researchers across its two campuses. The Panel agrees that this is important. However, looking forward, if the journal is to yield a meaningful output and help increase the quality of research outputs at the Centre, we feel that it

will be very important to integrate PhDs students more in the editing and reviewing process, so that the journal comes to present a professional development opportunity for them.

Looking forward and focusing on areas for improvement, the Centre needs to make a more concerted effort to attract external funding, including from European bodies. There seems to be a clear awareness of this among the Centre leadership but vision now needs to be translated into action. In this regard, the appointment of a Scientific Manager that can help with identifying funding calls and preparing applications will be a crucial step. Appointing a scientific manager may also serve to further enhance and improve the consistency of research outputs across all members of the Unit, and to facilitate participation of the CICP in wider national and international research proposals. We therefore strongly recommend that the CICP hires a qualified research manager with more than 6 years of research experience.

Also, during the site visit, we noted a potential tension between publishing in Portuguese and working in English, which a sense that perhaps the great importance attached to the latter sometimes can get in the way of contributing to local/national debates. While integrated researchers at the Faculty level seemed satisfied that they have access to adequate editorial assistance to enable them to publish to an English-speaking audience, PhD students seemed to feel that help with translation and proof-reading/editing is something that is strongly needed. This is something for the Unit to prioritize going forward.

Despite variation in research themes, the Panel found that the group of researchers attached to the Centre display a high degree of consistency in terms of the types of research outputs that scholars are aiming for. In other words, there appears to be a relatively clear common vision and ethos when it comes to thinking about how to produce high quality research, and where to publish. We also noted that CICP researchers have made a point of increasing participation in international research projects, workshop and conferences, and are focusing on leveraging such activities to increase publications in international journals.

One aspect that stands about the CICP is the great diversity of research activities and disciplinary perspectives in evidence across the team, which nonetheless features regular collaborative work and appears to inspire a clear sense of common identity. Overall, our site-visit left us with an impression of a strong group that is growing more cohesive.

The team also reflects a good balance with regards to gender and age – and is this balance also reflected across the different levels of seniority. The leadership of the team appears effective, demonstrating ability to lead the group and being able to convert a strategy into actual operation.

PhD students appear to be adequately integrated into the research groups

The plan for future research activities runs in the direction of "keep doing what we are doing well" rather than opening up new avenues of R&D. We feel that this is appropriate, especially given that the CICP results from an institutional merger that occurred only three years ago (between the NEAPP and the NICPRI). In light of this, it is both understandable and advisable that there is a focus on consolidation rather than expansion at this moment in time.

Some achievable goals are identified in the Research Plan, such as the organization of seminars and workshops and summer schools providing the regular opportunities for academic exchange and discussion both internally and with invited/visiting international scholars. These are important and appropriate goals.

Overall the Centre plans for the next 4-5 years are realistic, especially taking into account the human resources available. Giving the level of output in the preceding period compared to the funding available, it is our clear conviction that the CICP produces good value for money and that resources directed towards the Center will lead to increasing output both in terms of quality and quantity.

In terms of significance and applicability, the research output produced is of clear relevance to both a wider scientific/academic community and to the policy world, and some (but not all) is of sufficiently high standard to achieve international impact and recognition.

One of the main targets identified in previous evaluations was the need to publish more in high-ranked journals and to deliver a greater number of book chapters and other research output in English, and aimed at an international audience. While this target has clearly begun to be met (which explains our positive evaluation) more still needs to be done. In terms of sheer quantity of research output, the majority of integrated researchers appear to be productive. However, there is a wider spread in terms of quality, with some very high-quality output at the top, followed by a fairly long tail. Going forward, CICP should continue to strive to increase output in top-ranked journals and other recognized

international outlets, as well as continue to prioritize research activities with a direct impact on public policy. Less emphasis might perhaps be placed on producing book chapters in edited volumes, which often are low impact. Also, given that some members are researchers that appear to be less active, the CICP may consider making it a criteria for the Unit that ALL members must produce a certain level of output in order to retain their membership.

Apart from creating incentives for individuals to publish in peer-reviewed journals, it is important that the Centre continues to strengthen the support it provides (in terms of opportunities for presenting work in progress, and editing support) to enable members to publish more and better. Also, during the last period, a large number of research activities seems to stem from the research clusters on Public Policy and Democracy, whereas there was less evidence of a vibrant research agenda on, for example, European integration.

The Panel also noticed that the group of Integrated PhD Researchers has “shrunk” from 46 in 2017 to 34 in the current application. This seems to be helping to increase coherence across the team and to ensure that the group maintains an overall high level of excellence. However, there is still a large discrepancy in the productivity of individual members, with some individuals publishing a lot and in good places, while others publish only intermittently. In this regard, it is important that the Centre keeps in view the need not only to create incentives to publish (such as financial rewards) but also to put support structures in place.

In terms of participation in international research activities/networks, the Panel noted that although individual CICP researchers are active in international networks, and some have spent periods as Visiting Fellows in other Universities (such as LSE, and EUI) there are few regular institutionalised exchanges, nor is there much evidence of foreign researchers spending time at the CICP. This is something that could be improved by focusing more effort on attracting foreign scholars to the CICP.

Another area for improvement is to put in place clearer structures for addressing potential problems arising between students and their supervisors or between any other members of the team. Students and post-docs reported a high level of satisfaction with being associated with the CICP, but also were not aware of any formal institutional channels that could be used to report and address problems should this not always be the case.

The CICP may also wish to consider the possibility/need to appoint a secondary supervisor or “academic liaison” for PhD students associated with the Centre so they are not reliant on input and advice from one person alone.

Finally, and as a minor point, the CICP web-page (at least in its English version) is relatively sparse. It would be a good idea to seek to develop its content in order to raise the visibility of ongoing research activities.

We award five new PhD fellowships, but ask CICP to take into account our recommendations about appointment of 'mentors' or secondary supervisors, as detailed above.

We notice that the CICP needs a scientific manager to help identify funding opportunities and develop funding bids. The PhD fellowships are awarded in recognition of the excellent training provided at CICP, and the successful integration of young researchers into ongoing research projects.

Programmatic Funding is awarded to partially provide additional support for help in developing funding bids, to facilitate participation in foreign conferences and to enable CICP to invest in crucial 'infrastructure' including subscriptions to data-bases and scholarly collections as described in the Unit's own request for programmatic funding which we found to be both detailed and well justified.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Direito Europeu Económico Financeiro e Fiscal (CIDEEFF)

Coordinator: Eduardo Manuel Hintze da Paz Ferreira

Integrated PhD Researchers: 17

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 105 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Centro de Investigação em Direito Europeu, Económico, Financeiro e Fiscal (CIDEEFF, or the Centre) seems to have been very active in providing high-quality research and output (the book *The Euro and the Crisis Perspectives for the Eurozone as a Monetary and Budgetary Union*, edited by Nazaré da Costa Cabral, José Renato Gonçalves and Nuno Cunha Rodrigues – all three listed as researchers in the application, deserves a special mention).

There are many great international connections, both in academia and in policy-making, ensuring a great societal impact in the research areas which are – all four of them – very topical and society-relevant, notably in Portugal which underwent an Economic Adjustment Programme (May 2011-June 2014).

The publication of a specialized law journal, *Revista de Concorrência & Regulação*, on Competition & Regulation, in cooperation with the Portuguese Competition Authority, is a major achievement; it publishes in Portuguese and English. The journal would benefit from being fully bilingual (currently, the Portuguese entries are preceded by a summary in English and some articles are in Portuguese, while others are in English).

The great number of conferences organised in Lisbon serve to enhance its role as a vibrant and international city, beyond its touristic allure which has very much increased in the past 20 years.

About submitted publications the Panel noted the following:

- A volume with the outcome of the 2016 Congress of the EATLP held in Munich from 2 to 4 June. The main subject is on tax avoidance. It is of limited impact as this concerns conference proceedings.
- *After Brexit* (published by Palgrave, 2017) has scientific impact and has recognised scholars contributing to it.
- *The Euro and the Crisis* is an edited volume book (came out with Springer in 2018) that analyzes the effects of the recent crisis and evaluates potential solutions to the gridlock dominating the Eurozone and the European Union, concerning both monetary policy and budgetary and fiscal policy. This book includes a contribution by Joseph Stiglitz. This is an excellent research output. Moreover, the book sold 16,000 copies, thereby contributing to the funding of the CIDEEFF.
- *Antitrust in Distress: Causes and Consequences of the Financial Crisis*, a peer-review journal articles in *The Competition Law Review* in English
- The Autoridade de Concorrência, the Portuguese Competition Authority, sponsors the *Revista de Concorrência & Regulação* (Competition and Regulation Journal). It has existed for 9 years already. The organisation of the work and the peer-review is undertaken by CIDEEFF the journal is considered to be highly critical of the competition authority. It was published by Almedina but as of the current issue, it is published in online in open access. Peer-review is being implemented. PhD students confirmed the editorial independence of the journal.
- a PhD on GATT/WTO dispute settlement in Portuguese (*A Função Jurisdicional no Sistema GATT/OMC*)

These are relevant contributions, especially considering that they are volumes edited by Centre members (and not just individual chapters).

Researchers have CVs of recognised merit. For instance, one of the researchers is the Advisor to the Amsterdam Research Centre of International Taxation. The Vice Dean is a researcher at the Centre. Miguel Sousa Ferro is a

researcher with a great CV, having experience in law firms and taking part in international projects. Some researchers (PhD level) come from Brazil. Ana Paula Dourado has an impressive publication record (including publications in English) and a clear vision for the future. Nuno Rodrigues is Jean Monnet Chair who has an impressive publication record in Portuguese.

CIDEEFF objectives include consolidating policy impact, enhancing internalisation and promoting diffusion. Projects include digital economy (2 conferences planned), tax transparency and protection of whistleblowers. These are relevant fields.

Of particular note is an impressive impact-based initiative for the gathering of a database of Portuguese competition cases. It was recommended by the Panel that this could be linked up to the European Commission's database (which is notably empty for Portugal and not very well kept up-to-date for other Member States either, in spite of the obligation to notify judgment under Article 15(2) of Regulation 1/2003)². As concerning scientific analysis, CIDEEFF would work to summarize and analyze these cases as well as to consider other ways to best disseminate Portuguese case law on this matter.

The Panel was concerned about the disproportion in female to male integrated researchers (5 out of 15) and not convinced of the answer: it was argued that women are less interested in tax and economics (meanwhile there was a row of PhD students most of whom were female). The Panel invites the Centre to consider being the change they wanted to see.

The Panel is highly appreciative of the PhD students it met. While they write in Portuguese, most of them are fluent in English, with several publishing articles in English, albeit that they all prefer to write their theses in Portuguese. The PhD students (and the master students present) noted the beneficial effects of CIDEEFF as encountering foreign professors through the Centre (network effects). Professors were said to be very accessible. Summing up, the advantages of the Centre are: network, competition and international exposure (for example, the summer course in tax law that brings every summer to Lisbon top scholars in the field).

Interdisciplinarity seems a somewhat underdeveloped element of the Centre in comparison to several of its peers. Economics, mathematics and philosophy may be intertwined with traditional legal research but there was less encompassing inclusion of other disciplines as elsewhere. The Panel would like to invite CIDEEFF to give due consideration to the importance of interdisciplinary research.

Intensive outreach to Lusophone countries was noted, as everywhere in Portugal. The Panel did not receive an adequate answer to the question whether there is any connection with other Centres when providing legal support to Lusophone jurisdictions: cooperation seemed to extend to other members of the Faculty and to other R&D Centres in Europe but whether there is any combination with similar services rendered by other Portuguese law R&D Units remained unclear. This is an issue the Panel wishes to bring to the general attention of the FCT.

² <http://ec.europa.eu/competition/eojade/antitrust/nationalcourts/>

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Direito Penal e Ciências Criminais (CIDPCC)

Coordinator: Maria Fernanda dos Santos Martins da Palma Pereira

Integrated PhD Researchers: 23

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 180 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Centre is a R&D Unit at the Faculty of Law managed by the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminal Sciences and comprises 65 researchers. The Centre was founded in 2012. The Centre has established an identity as an interdisciplinary R&D Centre focusing on the study of the following three strands: 1) theories of imputation, 2) criminal liability and society, and 3) internationalization of criminal law. The Panel had initial concerns about the overlapping nature of these strands. After the conversations with researchers at the Centre this distinction was better understood, although not fully. Questions remain as to the organisation and structure of the Centre insofar as prioritisation of tasks and how they might mutually complement each other.

The Centre identified a number of ongoing projects including TESEU and HERACULES. The latter project aims to contribute “to a critical revision of the methodology of sentencing rationale” by moving away from black letter law, yet it rests on doctrinal assumptions and methodology. It focuses on ratio decidendi in Portuguese and the European courts case law. Another project is HYPATHA, which studies the effects of domestic abuse on children. The Centre has other highly relevant projects on its agenda, such as criminal law and neuroscience. Finally, the role of art in criminal law is also an important theme. It is not entirely clear how these distinct projects relate to general research strands. It is recommended to the Centre to define more clearly the three research strands and the underlying specific projects, including how resources will be devoted to each of the strands.

The Centre has links with senior colleagues from the faculty of medicine (one senior researcher in psychiatry was present at the meeting) and plans to launch a joint PhD in the field of criminal law and medicine. The Panel commends this approach because exploring the nature of the mind and way the brain works from medical perspective is highly relevant and important for the future of criminal law (for instance, for by better understanding the notion of the freedom of will).

The Centre is led by a research leader with extensive academic and professional experience (including a period as a judge of the Constitutional Court), Professor Maria Fernanda da Palma Pereira. The Panel had overall concerns about the structure and leadership of the Centre on two grounds: firstly, the Centre is fully directed by the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminal Sciences (in which case, it is important to establish the “added value” of the Centre specifically), and, secondly, on the basis of the meeting at the Centre, the Panel observed power dynamics when the leadership is concentrated around the head of the Centre who was named as a leader of many of the different aspects of work of the Centre. It is not fully clear how the subgroups of the Centre are managed. For instance, Inês Vieira da Silva Ferreira Leite and another senior researcher were indicated as responsible for HYPATHA project, yet it is not clear whether they are formalised leaders in one the identified research strands. The Panel evaluation therefore took into account their doubts about the effective management of the different strands, both in terms of the previous five years and the future plans.

It is recommended that the Centre devolves its structure with more equal opportunities for other researchers for growth and leadership.

There are agreements with universities in Spain (Malaga) and Germany (Göttingen). Collaboration started with personal contacts but was followed by a protocol on which future research is undertaken. The Research Centre for Latin American Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure at the University of Göttingen (CEDPAL) is a highly relevant institution of

international standing in the field of international and comparative law. It is clear that collaboration is ongoing as the recent joint event took place in Argentina in 2017 and another event is planned in 2019. Professor Kai Ambos (director of CEDPAL) is on the Centre Advisory Board and submitted a report overall recognizing the CIDPCC scientific relevance.

The Panel commends efforts by the Centre to forge international links with such relevant institutions.

The external report by Prof Mário Vieira de Carvalho, while positive in general, states that “there is a huge gap between the foreseen indicators for the five-year period and the effective achievements, not so much because of a lack of engagement or dynamism of the research team, but rather because the indicators were too optimistic and unreachable”. The Centre was not able to comment on that but suggested that Prof. de Carvalho might be referring to the lack of publications in English.

The Panel had some concerns about the research output of the Centre, which is not streamlined to international outlets and is primary in the Portuguese language. Out of five submitted publications two were in Portuguese with poorly translated abstracts, one is in German, and two are in English. Only one publication appears in an international peer-review outlet (Journal of Law, Probability and Risk published by OUP). The two Portuguese contributions deal with the concept of self-defence and cultural-sensitive crimes (such as FGM). Both topics are relevant, but the content cannot be assessed. The German contribution deals with white-collar crime and the regulation of capital markets and appears in a German outlet. The first contribution in English deals with the concept of consciousness and its relevance to criminal law. The drafting makes it difficult to grasp main ideas, but the theme is highly relevant. The last contribution is excellent and tackles a relevant topic of causation in criminal law and whether it can be informed both by legal reasoning and by factual evidentiary analysis.

The Centre recommends identifying internationally relevant outlets and encouraging younger researchers to write in English. We were informed that there is limited translation assistance available both for translating existing papers from Portuguese into English and for assisting the drafting process in English. The Panel notes the importance of such services, especially when it comes to assisting the drafting in English.

The Centre has interdisciplinary focus. There were several researchers with diverse backgrounds (psychiatry being one of them) present at the meeting. Most PhD researchers identified interdisciplinary focus as one of the pillars of their research. The Panel commends and praises interdisciplinary focus and hopes this approach continues. Most PhD students use international sources in their research but all of them write in Portuguese. The Panel encourages that some thought is given to PhDs being drafted in languages other than Portuguese to facilitate easier exchange of ideas with international peers. Or, that within the process of undertaking the PhD, consideration is given to a parallel strand where a PhD researcher is encouraged to publish research in languages other than Portuguese. It must be noted that all of topics covered by the Centre are of international relevance and not rooted solely in domestic law. *Mens rea*, consent in criminal law, incrimination in international criminal law, criminal law and neuroscience are all topics which should be discussed internationally and not just locally.

The Panel is concerned that the Advisory Board of the Centre is comprised of only male professors. The Centre leader explained this by the lack of internationally recognized women in the field of criminal law and the Panel cannot support this statement. The Panel recommends that efforts are made to include some female members in the Advisory Board as a priority.

The overall grade of the Centre is “Good”, with factors such as research output in peer-reviewed international outlets playing a crucial role in this assessment. The other factors influencing the grade are structural imbalances (dependence on the Institute), a lack of fully developed and coherent research strands and concentration of leadership at the top. The grade for criterion A is 3 due to deficiencies in research output in languages other than Portuguese. The background of researchers is of national relevance and therefore the grade in section B (merit of the researchers) is also 3. Finally, the grade in section C (plans) is 4 because of the relevance of the projects of the Centre. The Panel stresses that the latter grade is not an appraisal of the structure within which these projects are generated but the content and ideas. The Panel recommends creating a better-defined structure and strategy to undertake the interesting and topical research threads in a way which makes responsibilities of the different researchers, timelines and specific outputs clear.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Justiça e Governação (JusGov)

Coordinator: Patrícia Penélope Mendes Jerónimo

Integrated PhD Researchers: 58

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 5

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 678 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 347 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Panel agreed on the overall grade of the JusGov as 'Very Good' and commends the efforts of JusGov and its Director in particular in building the new interdisciplinary hub in the north of Portugal. It is clear that the Centre has an identity, well defined structure and a significant body of Integrated PhD Researchers (58). The Centre is the result of the merger in January 2018 of two former Centres at the Law Faculty at the University of Minho. The Panel understands that most of the 'old' researchers of the two previous Centres stayed onboard and that new ones have been attracted to the Centre. Therefore, the Centre grows in scope and expands. The Panel considers the merger to be beneficial for streamlining the activities of the Centre and consolidating research. There are six relevant research groups related to the following fields: EU law, technology, human rights, globalisation and democracy, judicial decision-making and criminal law. These are broad areas, but the Centre has a clear sense of direction in developing each field and, in particular, the items are linked to the UN 2030 agenda for sustainable development (SDGs). An example of how the Centre is developing the field was provided in that there are strong ties with the judiciary and the Centre provides training for judges. And that the Centre materials are used and cited by the courts.

There is strong emphasis on policy-related research that is impactful. There are formal as well as informal ties with a broad range of educational institutions (Brazil, Angola, Mozambique), and researchers of the Centre benefited from these ties (exchanges, information sharing).

The Centre has a clear Lusophone focus and the Panel commends the efforts of the Centre to maintain links and serve as a reference point for Lusophone countries. There are partnerships with Cape Verde, Timor, Angola, Brazil, Mozambique, São Tomé e Príncipe. The Panel considers this to be an important outreach and policy outcome for the Centre and part of its 'internationalisation' package. We were informed that some Lusophone countries, such as Angola use Portuguese legislation as a model (for instance, the old criminal code of Portugal). It is therefore natural and highly beneficial to promote knowledge exchange in the area of law with these countries. The Centre already attracted FCT funding, which is a sign of ambition and promise.

The Panel commends the Centre efforts to publish vacancies in both Portuguese and English and appreciates the idea of attracting more foreign researchers to the Centre. The main challenge, as understood by the Panel, is to make it financially attractive for foreign scholars to join the Centre.

We were informed that works by the researchers from the Centre have been cited 500 times over the past 3 years (including Angola Supreme Court citations about JusGov work, also Brazil, Mozambique, São Tomé e Príncipe). This is a good indicator and sign of impact. The Panel notes, however, that the quality of publications submitted for assessment could be improved. The only peer-reviewed journal listed is Masaryk University Journal of Law and Technology, which may not be of the highest impact. The Centre also submitted a conference paper (9 pages) on personal data and surveillance (workshop intelligent environments 2016) – not well-edited, in English, 7 page overview of EU data protection of biometrics in an edited volume by Springer 2017, proceedings in Portuguese originating from a Lusophone congress in 2016, an online book on human rights in Portuguese, edited volume on citizenship and solidarity. While

some publications are relevant, the list does not include most recognised outlets. The Panel appreciates that there is a clear balance to be struck between the local Portuguese audience (including, the judges) and an international audience, but when it comes to the latter, the Panel recommended aiming for more substantive publications with peer-reviewed outlets.

The above observations justify an overall grade of 4 in this criterion. It is clear that the Centre leadership appreciates this concern and works towards improving the research output and its visibility.

The team of Integrated Researchers is interdisciplinary since at least 6 researchers in the Centre hold PhD degrees in disciplines other than law (psychology, economics, IR) and some other researchers (including PhD students) conduct research that contains clear interdisciplinary elements. There is a (former?) supreme court judge as part of the Centre who contributes to the work of the Centre. This is a valuable perspective for the Centre. The Panel did not observe any gender balance related issues in this Centre. There are some clearly outstanding researchers at the Centre on all levels. In particular, the Panel recognises the work of Alessandra Aparecida Souza da Silveira and Patrícia Penélope Mendes Jerónimo. Some CVs of PhD students were empty in the form, but the Panel was able to locate information using the website of JusGov. The Panel is satisfied with the brief overview of PhD projects, which are diverse but relevant. Rebaz Kdir from Iraq is the only PhD student present writing his thesis in English. Other students write their thesis in Portuguese, but most of them indicated that they use English language sources as a substantial part of their research (which is necessary to include them in global conversations on their respective topics) and to improve visibility of their research later on. Based on the above the Panel takes the view that the Centre rightly deserved to be classified in criterion B with the grade 4).

The Centre stressed its willingness to set its own agenda and not follow the agenda of others. Moreover, there is willingness to cooperate with corporations and private actors using “co-labs” as vehicles for this exchange. The Panel supports this effort and hopes there will be continuation of this initiative. There is willingness to adapt goals to calls for funding, but without compromising the objectives of the Centre, such as alignment with 6 research groups and interdisciplinary approach. The Panel is satisfied with the clarity of the objectives, enthusiasm and the vision of the Centre. The Panel also commends the initiative for creating the School of Researchers to support junior colleagues with seminars and events and to promote exchange between senior and junior members of the Centre. It therefore finds that the plans for the future are excellent and awards a grade of 5 on point C of the application.

Recommendations for JusGov:

1. To enhance collaboration and scientific exchange with other Centres in Portugal researching similar themes and adopting similar mythological approaches (primarily CEVIS and IJP).
2. To improve its publication strategy by identifying a range of relevant, high impact peer-review journals as a target for the Centre_s publications. The Centre should advise junior scholars on their publishing options and encourage them to aim for high quality outlets.
3. The Centre is well-structured, but it would be beneficial to decentralise the governance structure by empowering leaders (PIs) of individual research groups (so that there is no rigid hierarchy but rather a more dispersed structure) with a clear sense of direction [a sociocracy].

The awarded Programmatic Funding is to be partially used for the purposes of hiring 1 Junior PhD Researcher, an IT specialist and any other goals that the Centre considers necessary.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Política, Economia e Sociedade (CIPES)

Coordinator: João de Almeida Santos

Integrated PhD Researchers: 25

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 2
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

More than half of the Unit Integrated Researchers lack substantive research outputs. Publications tend to be in outlets that lack broad recognition. The integrated members of the Unit lack publications in international peer-reviewed journals or other internationally acclaimed university presses. Considerably more than half of the publications are in lusophone outlets. This lack of rigorous academic output is evident already from the five flagship publications provided in the application. The only Anglophone publication was in a journal with unknown impact factor: Global Journal of Human-Social Science. All other publications were chapters in edited volumes or articles in lusophone outlets, which seem to be of limited impact and have narrow outreach.

The Unit also lacks coherence in its research themes. It appears to specialize in digital networks, security, social movements as well as urban studies and public administration. It is not clear how these specialties have developed and how they come together or if they speak to each other at all.

There are no PhD students in the Centre. The students we met during the site-visit are either visiting students or Master students, or they are PhD students elsewhere who work as teachers in Lusófona. Among the students who were present in the visit, half told us they chose to be integrated in CIPES because of a specific member of the Centre, namely Ana Lorga.

The five past achievements emphasized in the application are all individual activities in which members of the Centre have engaged. None of the activities highlighted refers to the Centre as a whole or to one of its research teams. In other words, the role of the Centre remains ambiguous. One gets the impression that all these achievements would have been equally likely to take place even in the absence of CIPES. Moreover, the content of some of these achievements is quite unclear. At least two of them seem to consist of invitations to participate in research projects, as opposed to representing an actual outcome of this research and demonstrating its academic and/or policy value.

There seems to be some tendency for professors to use undergraduate students as research assistants. This seems to be the case of the 16 undergraduate students who wrote country-specific reports about the Security project. It is unclear how fruitful and productive this practice is in the long-run.

In our very fruitful discussion with the members of the Unit, we inquired about what we felt was a considerable variety of research themes and topics, extending from best practices in tourism, to security and international conflict, to non-partisan social movements. From this discussion, as well as from our own exposure to some of this material, it became clear that there is a tendency to enter into new fields of research without any systematic prior work on the existing literature. This was for example evident when discussing about the new project on non-partisan social movements, which did not seem to build directly on existing work both on parties and party systems as well as on social movements in general.

In terms of impact, there was no clear attempt from the Centre as a whole to make any social or policy impact. As the presentation and the discussion amply revealed to us, impact is perceived as the individual exposure of members of the Centre on the national media. This is useful and very important but clearly only one dimension of social impact. Other manifestations of impact, linking the Centre to the civic society, seem to have been given less attention.

Res:Publica, the journal currently published by CIPES, seems to suffer from the same pathologies as all other journals hosted by other R&D Units around the country: it attracts mainly authors from Portugal, often related to the University and generally seems to promote an esoteric, inward-looking research ethos. Instead of encouraging members to seek publications in journals with much wider outreach and recognition, it seems to provide reverse incentives for low-cost but also low-benefit publications, within the same institution in which the journal is published. This leads to ill-spent research time, as the output fails to become a signal of international quality and vigor.

The impression we took from the application was that the Centre is mainly run by a group of senior researchers who are particularly active in organizing conferences and research reports over a wide array of issues. This impression was largely confirmed during our visit. This was particularly evident in the meeting with the junior researchers who mainly consisted of people that appeared to be overwhelmed with teaching both in Lusofona and elsewhere. This is of course a common pattern which extends beyond Lusofona. The problem however was that there seemed to be a large gap between the senior researchers and the more junior ones. The latter remained remarkably salient during the first, general, session and later seemed to be linked to the Centre only via teaching or a specific professor to whom they had been attached. We did not find among this group a collective identity around the Centre and its mission. There are no research seminar series or other regular events that could serve as vehicles for the formation of such a common bond within the research team.

There is some gender asymmetry within the integrated members. This asymmetry was also evident in the opening discussion, in which the responses were primarily given by the senior male members of the group.

For the period 2018-2022, CIPES has put forward four research projects: a comparative study of private vs public security; local partisan and non-partisan movements in Portugal; the role of network and ICT on public opinion in Portugal; and local sustainability and development strategies.

Although they seem interesting, these projects do not seem to fit easily together. None of them seems to build on the other. Moreover, none of these projects seems to draw on rigid theoretical grounds. There is no theoretical puzzle motivating these projects nor do they refer to previous work on the topic. Rather they seem to be more driven by ad hoc collaborations with either the private or the public sector.

One of CIPES strategic goals is to launch a PhD program. Yet it is not sufficiently clear what benefit the Centre will gain from having a PhD program, apart from more Research Assistance for some of these projects. By the same token, it is unclear what the PhD program will look like in terms of methodological and substantive academic training.

We would like to conclude our report with some recommendations for the future:

1. Reduce the volume of publications. The cost in time and resources of publishing in low profile outlets outweighs the benefits. It would be preferable to concentrate on some key contributions and try to work more closely on how to convert them into influential research outputs.
2. Try to consolidate the research agenda of the Centre. R&D Centres are formed because of a common underlying research or policy theme. Such a theme was missing from CIPES. Try to focus on fewer thematic units and exploit comparative advantages by working more closely on those selected.
3. Invest on young researchers by giving them resources to attend international conferences and to enhance their analytical skills. Try to attract people with skills and talent even if they do not come from the Lusofona or even Portugal in general. These people would boost the human capital of the Centre.
4. Invite selected researchers from outside the university to present their academic work and to talk about research in general. Doing so will help to generate synergies with members of the Centre.
5. Either abandon Res:Publica or try to internationalize its profile with rigorous peer-review processes and with the elimination of in-house publications. It might be a good idea to make this an English-only journal.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação Jurídico-Económica (CIJE)

Coordinator: Maria Regina Gomes Redinha

Integrated PhD Researchers: 20

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 212 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Centro de Investigação Jurídico-Económica (CIJE), Porto (the Centre) has rebounded after a reorganisation in 2015, mentioned in the submission. The Panel observed a group, led by three women researchers (the coordination team consists of Maria Regina Redinha – Coordinator; Maria Raquel Guimarães and Rute Teixeira Pedro – Co-Coordinators), which is actively engaged in research in relevant areas of the law and in organising outreach to society. On gender balance, this is certainly a progressive Centre.

We observed a Centre with a high level of citations of its researchers' output in Portuguese court decisions (600) relative of the Centre number of researchers which varied between 63 and 53 over the relevant period, with researchers visiting mostly from Brazil and Spain (see: <https://www.cije.up.pt/investigacao/investigadores-visitantes>), with a variety of topics researched and a strong belief in open access. This latter approach is likely to diminish publication in peer-reviewed international journals and was therefore flagged as an area of concern, as well as a laudable effort towards reaching as wide an academic audience as possible. Notably, choosing Cambridge Scholars as a publisher raised concerns among members of the Panel because this publisher may not be among the most respectable. The Panel has not been able to identify the open access policy on CIJE website nor its affiliation with Cambridge Scholars on theirs.

On internationalisation (in English or otherwise aiming beyond the Portuguese borders), the focus seems to have been on Lusophone and Iberian audiences and researchers, with the occasional inclusion of researchers from Italy, the United Kingdom and Israel.

We appreciated the Centre approach to "setting the agenda", rather than "following the agenda": this reveals an optimistic and bold attitude towards academic research and its role towards society. This is notably clear in the 2018-2022 agenda set for the CIJE which does not only intend to celebrate past developments on constitutionalism but also focuses on Law and Bioethics, piracy in a technologically fast developing world, envisages research on the compatibility of statutory professional bodies ("ordens" and "colégios profissionais") with competition law and, most notably, promises research on the EU's budget's possible counter-cyclical, or even redistributive role, an area of prime importance for the future of the Eurozone.

The Panel notes the shift away from an emphasis on tax law towards other topics of primary research interest, notably environmental law, company law and family law, with the occasional step towards monetary law: the 2017 conference on negative interest rates Euribor; see: <https://www.cije.up.pt/news/confer%C3%A2ncias-sobre-taxa-de-juro-euribor-negativa>. However, this conference, proudly noted in the submission, appeared to be a half-day meeting between Portuguese scholars alone and thus, did not contribute to internationalisation or mutual fertilisation of legal and economic research among European scholars. The Common Home of Humanity Project entails an international network the first research result of which was the publication: "SOS Treaty- Safe Operating Space Treaty- A New approach to managing our use of the Earth System". The 30th Anniversary of the Portuguese Companies Code project is a piece of research that is relevant for all Lusophone jurisdictions.

Similarly, we noted that the reference work in the submission on securities law is a 700-page long handbook in Portuguese with references to international practices and practitioners but without summaries of the main findings in English to engage in an academic conversation with them. In a similar vein, the Panel noted the absence of an English-

language website which would assist the Centre in reaching an audience beyond the Lusophone world. We also saw that the Law Faculty's 'English website' is actually in Portuguese: https://sigarra.up.pt/fdup/en/WEB_PAGE.INICIAL. The Panel recommends remedying this.

We noted the publication of an on-line law review: RED - Revista Electrónica de Direito (Electronic Law Review; <https://www.cije.up.pt/revistared>), which disseminates interdisciplinary academic research in the areas of business law and economics, favouring research on comparative law and EU law, as well as contributions from (again) Portuguese speaking countries. The Panel recommends that CIJE explores ways of making RED more accessible to an audience beyond the Portuguese-speaking countries.

The programme for the next four years includes major themes that are relevant for law and society, namely:

- "It's a wonderful (digital) world: Law in a digital and technological society";
- "Vulnerability and diversity: fundamental rights in context";
- "Economic Effects of Family in the 21st Century"
- "Tax Evasion in Portugal: The Relationship between Taxpayers and Tax Authority".

We particularly noted the relevance of economic issues concerning the family and the relationship between tax authorities and taxpayers – an issue we observe to be studied at other R&D Centres, as well. This raises the question how such diverse approaches to the same issue (tax culture) are harmonised across law R&D Centres in Portugal, if at all.

We noted the application for funding together with the University of Messina, National Council of Research, Italy, and Goethe University of Frankfurt, for the Programme Call relating to the SHIELD (Security of the Healthcare ICT system in the European Law of personal Data protection) project as a potentially promising collaborative research engagement with other universities. Nevertheless, we noted the emphasis on collaboration with Iberian scholars in labour law and the Panel considers that further outreach in all research areas to the English-speaking world to be called for.

The Panel is highly appreciative of the outreach to the local community, including the street art project in the direct surroundings of the Centre, i.e. the streets around CIJE.

We noted a clear need for special funding for the library – although the Dean indicated that each year – 100,000€ is devoted to the library, on our tour of the building we were shown old law books (from the 17th century onwards) that seemed in need of preservation. The Panel would like to call for special funding for this.

The Panel was unsure how independent the Centre could operate from the Faculty of Law and would like to flag this as a potential issue of governance. Similarly, the fact that the leading Co-Coordinator of the Centre is also the Vice-Dean of the Faculty may raise similar issues of governance.

The scope of future projects implies that an interdisciplinary approach is crucial as the Centre itself notes in its submission. The Panel advises the CIJE to give special attention to this aspect of research.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Centro Lusfada de Investigação em Política Internacional e Segurança (CLIPIS)

Coordinator: Jose Francisco Lynce Zagalo Pavia

Integrated PhD Researchers: 16

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 2
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CLIPIC is a relatively new R&D Unit, established just five years ago. The Unit was awarded a restructuring grant from the FCT in 2016 to help it to establish itself as a successful R&D Centre. The application submitted to the FCT in February and our subsequent site visit provided evidence of a group of researchers with a keen interest in and capacity for contributing to both research and policy development/implementation in select areas of national and international security. However, on balance, the Panel does not find clear evidence that the goal of establishing an R&D Unit with capacity to contribute to wider scientific and policy debates at national and international levels has been adequately met, nor do we see evidence that CLIPIS has the capacity or a clear strategy in place to allow it to meet this goal in the near future. In particular, one of our major concerns is that very few of the integrated researchers in CLIPIS publish in peer-reviewed journals -- whether national or international -- and that many outputs are either non-scientific (that is, take the form of magazine articles, editorials, or book reviews, etc.), or are simply not of a sufficiently high standard to contribute to either national or international scholarly and scientific debates.

Overall, the Panel finds that both the volume and the quality of the research outputs produced during period 2013-2017 by researchers integrated at CLIPIS are of an insufficient standard to meet the requirements for FCT funding. Among the five main outputs highlighted by CLIPIS as major contributions during the period we have been asked to evaluate, is the fact that CLIPIS is a member of the consortium of framework partners of CEPOL (The EU Agency for Law Enforcement Training) which won the bid to constitute a "CEPOL Knowledge Centre" for the period of 2018/2019. This is clearly an important achievement, and CLIPIS contribution to law enforcement training and other activities within the framework of CEPOL are indicative of activities with potential policy and societal impact. However, these activities do not strike us as providing a contribution to knowledge or research as such, nor have they resulted in either scientific publications or policy reports of interest to a wider set of stakeholders.

Among its major achievements CLIPIS has also highlighted the organization of three large conferences during the past few years, along with a new project entitled "Beyond the Southern Flank of Europe: Security and Development", which has not yet yielded any concrete research output. While the organization of conferences can be important in establishing links to other R&D Units and stimulating a vibrant research agenda, these activities by themselves do not make up for a lack of high-quality written research output.

Finally, as part of its achievements during the period under evaluation, CLIPIS also lists a large number of cooperation agreements, partnerships and "Memoranda of Understanding" with other organizations. However, the status of these cooperation agreements and partnerships is in many cases unclear. Some revolve around specific research projects or conferences, but others appear to be mainly loose agreements to seek closer collaboration in the future. While these various agreements provide evidence of a concerted effort by CLIPIS to build links to other organizations and R&D Units, they also do not substitute for the lack of concrete research outputs during the last five years.

CLIPIS is a small Centre with only 16 integrated researchers. As such, there are clear limits to what can be achieved in terms of collective research outputs. Nonetheless, it seems clear to the Panel that CLIPIS members as a group produce far too few international publications (by which we mean either publications in English, or publications in Portuguese which are aimed at political or scientific audiences beyond Portugal borders). Similarly, too few research outputs are published in peer-reviewed journals. Indeed, a disproportionate share of the publications listed by individual researchers consists of book reviews, magazine articles, encyclopedia entries, and conference papers. The dissemination of R&D results relies mainly on the production of in-house publications, which are neither peer-reviewed, nor widely red

by people beyond the university or CLIPIS immediate network. Finally, although the research activities of many members of CLIPIS are of potential relevance to both national and international policy audiences, we did not find evidence of either sufficient originality, consistency, or rigor of the research produced to achieve an impact on either national or international academic communities or on society at large. It is important to emphasize, that in making this judgement, we are placing weight on the lack of an upward trend: since 2013, when CLIPIS was founded, the number of quality publications does not appear to have been increasing.

In terms of a sound funding basis which could be used to assess “value for money”, the Panel notes that whilst CLIPIS carries out “paid for research” (that is, consultancy tasks) for several organizations, there is no evidence of an ability to attract other external funding – including international funding – for research activities defined by the Centre.

CLIPIS stated goals for the period 2013-2017 (as defined in response to the earlier evaluation of the Centre) were: (1) to address the small size of the R&D Unit in terms of human resources; (2) to address the lack internationalization, and (3) to improve the weak scientific production of most researchers, especially in peer-reviewed international journals. We do not see any clear evidence that any of these goals have been met, nor do we find that CLIPIS has presented a clear plan for how to achieve these goals in the future.

Contribution to Advanced Training: Since CLIPIS does not have an accredited doctoral program, there is currently no direct contribution of advanced training (PhD and postdoc level) to speak of. However, the Unit does have a small number of integrated students (one master student and one PhD) who express a high level of satisfaction with the level of support they receive from CLIPIS (both infrastructural and in terms of general guidance and supervision).

Lastly, given that many of the Centre research activity focuses on security-related issues, or issues related to crime, law enforcement, and migration, we find that the lack of attention to ethical issues in the application is disappointing.

All the integrated researchers reported that they receive a large amount of infrastructural support from CLIPIS (for example support for attending conferences) which is very important to their work. This is positive.

However, there does not seem to be any clear criteria for integrating researchers in the Unit. The present group has no clear coherence, and the Centre research projects seem to be dictated more by the availability of external funding, or by the interests of a few senior members, than by identifiable intellectual strengths/interests across the team. Some members are not integrated into any of the specific research projects currently being undertaken, but are conducting research that bears little direct relevance to the activities of other members of the team. These researchers also do not appear to be integrated into the future plans/activities of the Centre.

The group has only one member who consistently publishes in high-ranked, peer reviewed journals and that member seems only very peripherally attached to Centre.

Finally, there is a noticeable lack of gender balance, with only one member of the 16-strong team being female. There are no plans to address this imbalance, nor did we detect any considered reflection on why this imbalance exists (portuguese culture was blamed, which we judge a highly implausible explanation given the healthy gender balance we witnessed in most of the other Units we evaluated).

The CLIPIS 2018-2022 activity plan, in the Centre own words, can be “broadly defined as an evolution in continuity”. This is also how the Panel understands the plan. The plan describes a continued strong focus on conference organization and in-house publication. It also emphasizes continued collaboration with CEPOL and the wish to conclude a number of protocols and partnership agreements with French, Angolan, São Tomé e Príncipe, Spanish and South African institutions – none of which described as leading to concrete research outputs.

In addition to publishing in international journals, the strategic plan mentions the determination to continue to publish in newspapers, magazines, book chapters, conference proceedings. As such, the plan fails to address the most crucial problems which were identified in the last evaluation, namely the lack of high-quality scientific output, and the absence of publications in peer-reviewed outlets. We thus see no evidence that the problems identified at the last evaluation (especially an unsatisfactory publication record) are being addressed, nor do we see evidence that the Unit has a clear plan in place for how to address these problems in the future. For example, there are no specific plans for expanding the size of the Unit, nor does the application identify any specific needs in terms of building new expertise (either through hiring or training). Instead, there seems to be a strong focus on continuing with frequent conference events (evidenced by the fact that CLIPIS is asking for funding to plan a further 12 conferences). The strategic plan acknowledges the need to encourage members of the Unit to publish in international peer-reviewed journals. However, the only concrete step

mentioned in this regard is to support members in travelling to international events and to provide support for translation into English. The Panel does not find that this constitutes a convincing publication strategy. Overall, the strategic plan presented by CLIPIS seems more appropriate for a Centre with the ambition to style itself as a think tank, rather than a scientific R&D Centre. There are also no concrete plans for addressing the current gender imbalance.

One of CLIPIS main strategic goals appears to be to launch a PhD program. Yet it is not sufficiently clear what benefit the Centre will gain from having a PhD program or indeed whether sufficient capacity exists at present to provide the necessary supervision and advanced training (including in methodology) beyond a narrow set of issues.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: ICPOL - Centro de Investigação do ISCPSI (ICPOL)

Coordinator: Nuno Caetano Lopes de Barros Poiães

Integrated PhD Researchers: 18

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 141 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

Programmatic Funding: 170 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit was established in 2004 with a particular focus on police studies. The Centre is multidisciplinary as integrated researchers come from various fields: medicine, literary studies, history, law, criminology. The Centre has a good ratio of Integrated Researchers (18 mentioned in the application) in proportion to the scientific output of the Centre. Gender balance is adequately addressed by the Centre. The Panel was informed that police has one of the best gender ratios in the sphere of public services in Portugal. Women undertake the commander's course at the academy that is a path to senior positions. The Academy encourages female police participation and training in Lusophone countries. Female researchers are active in the Centre.

The Centre has a unique position as a police training academy and a research institution. The Panel appreciates the point made by the Centre as to the importance of police studies. The research produced by the Centre has clear societal impact.

There are three lines of research in the Centre, namely police work and organization, police and society, and conduct of policing (problem-solving). Research is conducted primarily on the basis of social-sciences methodology. The Panel comprised of legal scholars had concerns as to whether it is in the best position to assess the work of the Centre, which is grounded in criminology, psychology and sociology, as well as law.

The Panel observes that the initial report lacked specificity and it was difficult to ascertain relevant facts solely based on the application. Many issues were clarified during the site visit, which affected the final grade positively. The Panel recommends for future applications to introduce more concrete information in the report.

The publications submitted for assessment were of sufficiently high quality, four of them published in English in peer reviewed journals. Two submitted publications were published in the European Police Science and Research Bulletin, and they constitute relevant studies on police activities, in particular police decision-making. These publications are of good scientific quality and published in a relevant peer-review outlet. It was explained at the meeting that the Centre balances the interests of two audiences – research community and police professionals. European Police Science and Research Bulletin cater to the interests of the latter category. The other two publications are directed at scientific community and are published in the Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine. Both of them deal with a pertinent issue of deaths resulting from police shootings at vehicles. One remaining publication is in Portuguese peer-reviewed journal and relates to social media and police image. The latter publication was co-authored by Lúcia Maria de Sousa Gomes Gouveia Pais, and the Panel recognizes her as one of the distinguished researchers.

The Centre has collaboration structure whereby research is directed along three previously identified lines. There is a coordinator assigned to each line of research who monitors the development of the initial idea and helps with attracting scholars from relevant fields, either from within ICPOL or from the outside. This is a feasible process. The Panel commends the fact that the Center publishes relevant master theses and integrates junior researchers in its work.

The Centre identified a number of international and national partners, including Interpol and Frontex. These are relevant institutions where research can be tested, applied and discussed at a practical level. The Panel commends these collaborations.

The Panel congratulates the Centre on attracting external funding from the European Commission under Horizon2020 program (3 projects). This is an achievement and attests to relevance and quality of the work done by the Centre. This information should have been made more explicit in the application form.

Major events lab deserves special mention as it consists of only three researchers, yet this Unit focuses on an important research issue, namely good police practices at major public events. This is a highly relevant topic, especially with the increasing need to protect crowds from attacks as opposed to simply managing crowds. The idea is that good practices developed for big public events will extend to all police activities.

The Panel recognizes high quality of researchers at the Centre and in particular the way they combine their research, teaching and professional commitments. The merit of the researchers is recognized by the 5 grade on criterion B.

The Panel commends the strong ethics component of the Centre work.

Most of the researchers at a junior and senior level identified lack of time as their most pressing concern in conducting research. The Panel is impressed by the significance of the research at the Centre and therefore recommends finding a solution to enable researchers to take a paid leave to concentrate solely on research (sabbatical).

The budget proposal for ICPOL is modest, since it does not include PhD research fellowships that constitute the bulk of the amounts at University-based R&D Centres. The funding is mainly requested for external missions, that the Panel fully support in order to realise the internationalisation objectives and research at the Centre. Funding for travel for events was one of the main needs cited by both the PhD researchers and the junior/senior researchers in the Centre. The Panel supports the researchers travelling to international conferences and meetings, especially those which envisage participation in funded projects (primarily EU-funded projects). The Panel felt that researchers outside of Portugal would be keenly interested in the research undertaken by the Centre. The Panel also supports funding for technical equipment for the simulation lab, in particular eye-tracking devices, as this equipment is crucial for research activities conducted by the Centre.

The Centre is recommended to encourage writing PhD theses in English and to focus on high impact publications in peer-reviewed journals.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: IJP - Instituto Jurídico Portucalense (IJP)

Coordinator: José Luís Caramelo Gomes

Integrated PhD Researchers: 57

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 676 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

IJP was evaluated for the first time in 2013 when it was awarded a mark as “Good”. It differs from most other R&D Units in the field of law and political science that are evaluated in 2018 since IJP is formed of several different institutions. Thus, it has a main management institution (UPT), two management institutions (IPLeiria and IPLisboa) and another three participating institutions (IP Castelo Branco, IP Cávado and Faculdade de Letras of University of Porto). The application covers 57 Integrated PhD Researchers. This number probably reflects the fact that so many institutions are involved in IJP, but the CVs of many of the integrated researchers displayed a very low research output meaning that prior to the site-visit the Panel had doubts as to whether IJP should be classified as “Weak” or “Good”.

The applicant lists 10 main publications from 2013-2017 authored by Integrated Researchers and reflecting the diversity of the R&D Unit. The two first publications are English-language edited works published by Wolters Kluwer (Vesna Rijavec et al. *Dimensions of Evidence in European Civil Procedure* (Wolters Kluwer 2016) and Vesna Rijavec, et al., *Simplification of Debt Collection in the EU* (Wolters Kluwer 2014)). Integrated Researchers listed in the application are both editors and amongst the chapter contributors and the Panel has attributed particular weight to these works that constitute international research outputs. Other listed publications may be valuable, but do not constitute research output to the same extent. Thus, Arthur Hartkamp, et al., *Cases, Materials and Text on European Law and Private Law* (Hart Publishing 2017) is a – text, cases and materials work – that first of all is intended to reproduce existing knowledge rather than creating new knowledge. In addition, the contribution from IJP to that work is very modest. Similarly, at the site-visit it was made clear by the R&D Unit to the Panel that “The encyclopedia of migrants - a collective enterprise to share experiences and knowledge on migration in Europe” does not set out to disseminate legal research (still, the work is taken into account for the present assessment as explained below).

The application also makes references to the *American Journal of Comparative Law* and to Cambridge University Press. At the site-visit the Panel asked for explanations regarding these references. Based on the answers provided, the Panel is left with the impression that the R&D Unit has not published in these outlets and that the Integrated Researchers of the R&D Unit do not take an active part in the scientific running of these outlets. The Panel therefore finds it rather peculiar that the outlets are mentioned in the application.

Whereas there is considerable room for both increasing the level of the research output and its volume, the Panel also found that – taking into account all publications listed by the integrated researchers in the application – IJP had worked actively to further the production of legal research at the international level.

Looking more broadly at the R&D Unit's output, the Panel found that there was a clear impact on society. For example, the above mentioned “encyclopedia of migrants” stems from an EU funded project, and whereas the R&D Unit explained that it was not research as such, the Unit also showed that it had an important impact on society.

The R&D Unit made it clear that when deciding on what projects to pursue, they pursued a dual strategy. On the one hand, they emphasized that they actively pursued a top-down approach where they first of all focused upon bidding for a variety of externally funded projects. On the other hand, it was also clear that the Unit allowed the researchers to take a bottom-up approach. The latter was illustrated by a project in the intersection of neurosciences and law.

During the period 2013-2017 the R&D Unit had particular challenges since it was not authorised to run a PhD programme (authorisation only from October 2016). However, the Unit managed to cope with this difficult situation by establishing an informal partnership with the University of Salamanca. Also, when it came to the actual way of making the several different IJP partners (that together made up the R&D Unit) work together, the R&D Unit displayed a willingness to find ways of “making things work”. Thus, at the site-visit the participants displayed how an internet-based system had been established to allow the integrated researchers and other participants to collaborate in practice.

All in all, the Panel had to balance, on the one hand, that the research output was rather low compared to the number of integrated researchers, but, on the other hand, that the R&D Unit had shown a willingness to publish internationally and had shown an ability to make several different institutional partners work together in one R&D Unit. The Panel therefore found that it would not be appropriate to qualify the R&D Unit as “Weak” and decided to award the mark of “Good” for the activities completed in the period 2013-2017.

IJP Integrated Researchers collaborate with non-Portuguese universities and this collaboration is also reflected in the application. Indeed, the R&D Unit originally intended to be an English-language-only R&D Unit, but had to abandon this idea.

The research projects pursued both displayed a reasonable international outreach and a fair level of interdisciplinarity. When it came to issues such as balancing age and gender, the R&D Unit also scored well.

The institutional set-up with several different institutions jointly forming the IJP R&D Unit necessarily made day-to-day collaboration more challenging, but the Unit had actively addressed this (as has been explained above).

All in all, the Panel found that the R&D Unit worked well (good).

As an R&D Unit IJP has had appreciable challenges in the past, both because it is constituted of several different institutions which makes collaboration more challenging, and because, prior to 2016, it did not have authorisation to run a PhD programme. These challenges have been met, and an ambitious plan for activities for the period 2018-2022 has been laid out _ with a clear international dimension and drawing on the strengths of key members of the Unit. However, the plan would have been strengthened if it had been clear how its different components were to interact and if it had been somewhat more specific so that it would appear to be fully realistic. Still, the Panel found the plan to be good.

Overall, the Panel found that despite the weaknesses, IJP deserved to be classified as “Good”.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Instituto do Oriente (IO)

Coordinator: Carlos Manuel Piteira

Integrated PhD Researchers: 11

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 130 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 3

Programmatic Funding: 50 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

Portugal-Asia-America-Africa relations are the overarching focus of the IO, including many countries over a large geographical scale. With different foci of study, its researchers create and manage links across vast distances, and the financial assistance provided by the Unit to their researchers was greatly appreciated. This small and very specialised Unit includes some serious researchers and provides value-added for less experienced researchers, producing some material with both academic and public relevance. Despite some recent efforts, there remain challenges for staff in terms of research time and international orientation, and there may be an issue with managerial ambitions and ability to specify strategic plans. With some help, the evaluators are confident this could develop into a Unit that is more intellectually and financially substantial and sustainable.

Moving beyond conventional Area Studies research, there is some systematic study of relations in both directions using inter-disciplinary approaches and analyses from Area Studies, Anthropology, International Relations and Political Science. The Unit focuses more on how society, culture and politics meld together in their research, with perhaps less focus on political economy and geopolitics. The IO has extended a more generic (for Portugal) focus on relations from Portugal to lusophone countries and is developing an interesting strand of research and networks on connections between lusophone African, Asian and American countries independent of Portugal. This research into (and collaborations between researchers involved with) these connections promises, for instance, to illuminate the increasing practice of South-South cooperation in development discourse and policy. The IO therefore has potential, at an important moment of change in international relations, to contribute meaningfully to this relatively new avenue of international R&D.

Within their specialism, the IO offers opportunities for researchers to develop new research agendas for themselves. Junior researchers felt supported in material and professional terms, and identified with IO. Funding is made available for attending international conferences, which are critical for researchers to project their research abroad while facilitating contacts and connections to other scholars, and also for organising conference in Lisbon (admin, logistical, and publications support). Researchers have also been able to bring international scholars to IO. The IO supports the development of language skills in languages of the countries that its researchers study and Europe, and also supports translation to Chinese and other relevant languages. Thus the IO was considered to help researchers across three levels: institutional (e.g. MoUs for collaborations), research (projects with the FCT and other partners; funding for fieldwork and conference attendance), and with administration (budgets; research management).

In addition to Portuguese language publications in national outlets, the evaluators note many published outputs in English and Mandarin in international journals and books. Although researchers appear to be reasonably productive, too few outputs take the form of scientific journal articles in well-ranked, peer-reviewed international journals, and few seem to speak to a wider academic international audiences and debates. The current style of production provides a basis, via expertise, networks and skills, for the further internationalisation of activities and dissemination of results, leveraging the specialist knowledge to contribute to wider empirical as well as conceptual/theoretical debates. The

quality of journals chosen for publication is not always what it could be, and researchers should be encouraged to aim higher and wider, even with empirics that are on the face of its “niche” or specificity.

With regard to the in-house journal, *Daxiyangguo*, the management team values this output and considers it a vehicle to showcase their own and others work. However from the outside, it is not clear how valuable this is for the team and its mission. The in-house journal needs indexing and demands a lot of resources, which will only increase if production is increased to twice yearly in pursuit of indexation. Combining this work on an in-house journal with the other challenges and pressures faced by its team (including teaching), IO may take longer to build a volume of peer-reviewed rigorous outputs to take it beyond being mainly a national reference to also being a confident international reference.

The Unit supports researchers who are already primed for publishing internationally, but appears to have less success in supporting changes in publication norms among more senior researchers or junior researchers who are recruited without that existing orientation. Thus, methods to increase output, and grow and improve English language and other international publications currently look insufficient. In addition, the two volumes proceeding from the conference on Timor-Leste is evidence of the subject-specific international networks inside the area of interest to the Centre, but published in-house. A relatively small proportion seems to be written in or translated into English making internationalisation and wider dissemination difficult.

The IO provides some societal relevance considering its small size, and sometimes combines research well with its social outreach activities. The research team undertakes media appearances, depending on the news topics of the day, and provides assistance to the Portuguese government, particularly the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and National Agency for Investment for questions of Foreign Direct Investment. In addition, a series of documentaries on Macau and China have also made the Portuguese general public more aware of the importance of Asian countries in contemporary politics and the relations between China and Brazil, and Latin America more broadly. It has also addressed contemporary social issues of the perceptions of immigrants in Portugal. The IO's work on the *Revista de Imprensa Asiática* is an important (and relatively low input) initiative in bringing Asian news, and Asian perspectives to lusophone audiences. IO researchers have also given expert testimonies in Latin America on East Asia and hosted Chinese civil servants, serving as bridge to other Ministries and departments they visited. Such tailored public outreach is undermined by publishing academic material in internationally inaccessible and low impact academic outlets.

The IO is integrated into a highly internationalised set of networks, which opens them up to new research agendas and funding opportunities as well as offering opportunities for IO researchers to publish and present outside Portugal. IO was seen by its members as a calling card that opens doors to other institutes (such as the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) or Singapore University). The team successfully engage in networks on a narrow basis and then develop that link into something more substantive, e.g affiliation with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) began as a useful contact in energy research, and the possibility of further and deeper links are being pursued.

The mainly Portuguese team had one member from Macau, and PhD students from China. While many researchers have international networks, foreign training is not immediately evident across the board. Consistency in publication for the individual researcher and for the group as a whole should be enhanced, as well as growing more dynamism, a living research environment for staff and students, and to build less ad hoc interdisciplinarity. The gender balance seems good across the Unit as a whole, and also across different levels of seniority, though with a preponderance of older males among the senior researchers. The IO post-docs feel consulted. The Centre has earnest and proportionate plans for gradual expansion, placing store in educating newer generations of scholars to renew their research portfolio and increase their research capacity. Yet they did not request additional post-doctoral fellows, which we found difficult to explain given the small size of the Unit.

The IO members all take their teaching seriously as a commitment with and to students and future researchers in Asian Studies. They bring their interdisciplinarity into their teaching, so that students can start to appreciate the contributions of several approaches, and approach supervising students with the flexibility of co-supervision across different disciplines.

The Special Issues edited by Dr Isabel David show her strong contribution, first to international scholarship on increasing challenges to democracy and unresolved political issues in the region; secondly, to issues of public concern, and finally to the IO itself. Dr David can also be seen to be an international reference points through her invitations to advise EU bodies, as Editorial Board and reviewer for highly regarded international journals.

The management team has the confidence of other researchers in their individual research capacity, supervision and collegiality, but did not provide a sense of clear strategy. The failure to identify the Chinese PhD students alongside the

Portuguese was particularly disappointing. There was a change of leadership between the filing of the FCT evaluation form and the site visit, but acquainting yourself with the activities and people in this very small Unit should have been their first priority.

More formal and frequent opportunities for researchers to communicate would improve their opportunities to develop the Unit collective organisational identity. In general an overall strategy should be developed to shape and eventually grow the team according to a vision of what IOs unique role and mode of operation could be at a national and international level.

In the period 2013-17, the leadership made a sound strategic decision to prune some of the less productive members from the Unit; all integrated researchers should be expected to show consistent and rigorous scholarship of a good standard. However, the leadership seems to not yet show ambition in improving the output level beyond current standards. The leadership seems careful and considered, but they seemed to have difficulties in clarifying the direction of travel beyond supporting individual researchers.

The evaluators are mystified as to why the IO did not request funding to employ more staff urgently, within target areas. This is symptomatic of a need for the senior team to be more focused on specific strategic decisions and actions. The Centre is preparing funding applications, and departmental support on the administrative aspects of grant applications was appreciated.

The journal is considered to be an important historical contribution from the Unit. However, the journal swallows a large amount of human and other resources, and will take more in the short term during the indexing process and in the long term if the indexing process is successful. The journal and loyalty to it diverts research material away from academically more recognised and weighty outlets. Researchers need to aim for higher profile contributions. If the decision is taken to continue with this journal, where will IO find resources (in an already very small team) to expend in this endeavour? The opportunity costs should be taken seriously: time spent editing is time not spent publishing.

Overall, this is a serious Centre, carrying out solid and in some cases eye-catching academic research but with some weaknesses and gaps. The Unit has the potential to do better. Now it is a good starting point for consolidation and growth.

When researchers come to the management with a solid plan for publications and activities, they are offered support within the means available, which is positive. However, there is less evidence that the management are expanding researchers existing ambitions, or providing the focus that would enable researchers to aim higher individually and collectively. In order to fulfil that potential, the management team needs to be more ambitious and concrete in their plans for themselves; and how they support the development of individual researchers plans and ambitions, setting ascertainable near and longer-term goals with specified means. The Centre planning processes simultaneously need to be inclusive to ensure that researchers and their priorities are more effectively integrated and the Unit becomes more than the sum of its parts. Furthermore, in addition to the practicalities of language support and financing conference attendance, the Centre could do more to prioritise international publications (rather than underwriting Daxiyangguo) in the minds and practices of their researchers and the ethos of the Centre so their work can be exposed to international expertise and gain the gravitas and circulation needed to reach beyond being a national reference.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Instituto Jurídico da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra (IJ)

Coordinator: José Manuel Aroso Linhares

Integrated PhD Researchers: 75

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 657 K€

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

Overall, the Panel noted that UCILeR has undergone significant growth and transformation. From just over fifty researchers in 2013, UCILeR has grown to nearly eighty integrated researchers. In the midst of such growth, UCILeR underwent a massive transformation in 2015, abandoning the existing model of research lines and groups in favour of a more interconnected organizational structure. While there is clear understanding of the need to modernize and face contemporary challenges, the Panel believes that both the aim and the organizational structure of UCILeR require more reflection. The Faculty of Law at the University of Coimbra has a well-established international identity and reputation, but UCILeR needs to consider and define its own narrative and point of view. The very idea of legal research is changing at UCILeR: from single author work set in a traditional hierarchy of researchers to more collaborative, multi-disciplinary work from a horizontally organized, integrated team. Cultural change within institutions takes time, but a clear vision to facilitate such change is essential. This vision is lacking still and the outline of the Centre activities was difficult for the Panel to understand. When asked what sets UCILeR apart, the researchers mentioned both their vastness and their possibility to create intersections as their strength. UCILeR needs to create a model that serves the wide array of talent and disciplines evident in their team. The Panel notes that the size of the team can be a strength of UCILeR but for the mass to be effective a professional infrastructure will need to be built to bring more coherence and inter-connectedness to the plan of activity. This infrastructure will have to address how the team communicates to build integrated teams with clear aims for publication and social impact.

As concerning the quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities for 2014-2017, the Panel noted the lack of an overarching publication strategy. Many of the Centre publications are edited volumes and commentaries. Relative to the number of integrated researchers, in the last cycle (2013-2017) UCILeR has not produced a large body of peer-reviewed articles in international journals. More guidance is needed so that the team is making strategic choices when publishing its work to optimize the impact of the relevant, quality research that was described to the Panel. Some of the main contributions selected in the application did not showcase the international relevance of the work of UCILeR. There seems to be a great focus on scientific meetings. While scientific meetings are relevant, they are also costly, and there should be a clearer strategy concerning the utility of events and how the organization of meetings promulgate high-impact publications and outputs, greater integration of the team of researchers/students and/or social impact.

In the field of internationalization, UCILeR evidences a clear commitment to international activity, but no clear strategy as to what this means in practice. There are a number of publications in languages besides Portuguese, but in order to fully realise ambitions in internationalization, it would be highly beneficial to publish more in English and other foreign languages. UCILeR engages in significant international work with Lusophone countries, also Poland, but should consider widening the scope of publishing more outside of Portugal. While doctoral students often conduct their research in different languages and have internationally focused dissertations, the students that spoke with the Panel have all chosen to publish their doctoral theses in Portuguese. While this seems to be a national trend, when topics address an international topic there should be more consideration to encourage students to publish in other languages.

Concerning the dissemination of scientific results, it is commendable that many of the works are available open-access. While the Centre website is available in English, the English version of the website is significantly under-developed and some of the available descriptions are vague and often unclear. More work on the English version of the website should

be undertaken. UCILeR has a YouTube channel (Instituto Jurídico da FDUC) with a small collection of videos of past events. The videos seem well edited, which lends to the belief that there is technical support for sharing longer, substantive content of the events such as full speaker interventions and lectures (though no content was found in English). UCILeR also has an active Facebook account to communicate events, though again content is only available in Portuguese. More thought could be given in terms of disseminating the social impact of the scientific work generally. The website in this regard functions more as a repository of publications and projects rather than a dynamic platform to communicate to a diverse public. Considering the social importance of the Centre projects and publications, there is a social responsibility to deliver results to a broader constituency.

The Panel noted that a number of integrated researchers have produced relevant national scholarship, but that there was a more limited scope of international scholarship relative to the size of the research team. The Panel was especially impressed with the doctoral students and their commitment to research as well as with the junior researchers in terms of their interaction with each other across disciplinary lines. As concerning the diversity of the research team, while the Panel appreciated the inclusion of non-lawyers as integrated researchers in UCILeR and the Centre commitment to interdisciplinary work the Panel did note that many researchers received their formal education at the University of Coimbra and more work should be done to attract foreign scholars as well as scholars educated outside of the University of Coimbra. In terms of gender balance, UCILeR should make a greater commitment to gender parity, particularly at the senior level.

Concerning the plan of activities of the Centre for 2018-2022, the 'vulnerability/plurality/undecidability' framework is vague and needs further development. These lines should be more clearly formulated and accompanied by a specific publication and internationalization strategy. While there is some evidence of strategy towards priority lines that reflect past research strengths (e.g. energy) the concern of the Panel is that there is no clear, overarching strategy.

In summary, the key recommendations of the Panel are as follows:

- To develop an organizational structure and research plan that promotes a clear, coherent strategy for UCILeR and facilitates the interconnectedness of researchers.
- To develop a publication strategy that optimizes impact both nationally and internationally.
- To provide more guidance concerning publication strategy to junior researchers and doctoral students.
- To encourage more publication in English and foreign languages, particularly amongst doctoral students.
- To further develop the English version of the website.
- To further consider social impact through a diverse range of deliverables.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Instituto Português de Relações Internacionais - Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (IPRI-NOVA)

Coordinator: Henrique Nuno Severiano Teixeira

Integrated PhD Researchers: 44

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 664 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 470 K€, including for 2 (Junior) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

IPRI-NOVA is an academic research institute devoted to academic studies broadly in the fields of Political Science and International Relations. It has been an autonomous R&D Unit of NOVA FCSH since 2003 with status as Public Utility since 2010. It is committed to scientific research, specialised training and knowledge transfer and social value creation.

In many ways this is a very strong R&D Unit with much going for it. 2013-2017 has proved a productive research period, with all forms of publications rising, and journal articles rising healthily from 17 in 2013 to 67 in 2017. Of these, roughly 50 percent are in peer reviewed outlets (up 28), but with just 15 (under one quarter) in SCOPUS-indexed outlets. However, the rise seems real and broadly based with some international quality publications to show for it. Moreover, it has happened with only a rise from 30 to 37 integrated researchers holding PhDs over the period. The special issue in Comparative Politics is evidence that IPRI-NOVA's researchers are engaging with an international audience and able to command the confidence of a quality journal. The publication in Electoral Studies is already highly cited (published 2016) indicating that IPRI researchers can achieve international academic impact. To publish a number of books in international publishing houses (2017) is also an achievement. The total number of integrated researchers is high, however, (82) and the institute would do well to consolidate the advances made by broadening the number and breadth of researchers submitting and publishing in international peer reviewed outlets. Much effort and material goes into the quarterly in-house IR journal, which is a firm tradition adding to IPRI claim to being a national and lusophone reference point, but it should be considered whether this detracts from international and external publishing.

The Institute senior researchers gain much including some administrative support by being members, and IPRI and the department at NOVA benefit from having evolved together. Without the identity composed partly of personal and group relations, this would probably not have happened in the same way, indicating some clear value-added of the institute as a whole. In particular, researchers express that IPRI has been crucial for developing research agendas, and for nurturing a feeling that they belong to something bigger, while retaining the freedom to pursue own research goals. There are universal incentives for all to publish while also conditional or reward-based ones, which could support the growth and widening of national and international publications. More junior researchers are given freedom, but also encouraged by senior researchers to participate in projects of the Centre in some cases working closely with the PIs. They often see themselves as part of a network and happy about being part of the community of researchers. The brand is also an advantage, e.g. collaboration with researchers from Prague recently was partly enabled by identification with IPRI. PhD students can attend seminars, and in general find it interesting to see others work, but this is not always within own field of work. Sometimes they present at lunchtime seminars. They are encouraged to go to international conferences but the Centre seemed not to be involved in sending them, and more could be done for them to attend big international conferences such as ISA or EISA.

There is plenty of evidence of frequent participation in international networks and research projects, such as the Jean Monnet Network on Atlantic Studies, V-DEM and VIADUCT (on Academic Dialogue on EU-Turkey Cooperation). International funding has been secured in a number of cases and there are further ongoing project bids under development, with seed funding from the Faculty for preparing a big project being received. There is a tradition for

garnering expert review of project drafts and post-award help for those securing grants. The overall strategic vision of the Centre needs to be nurtured to prevent eclectic development and ad hoc project commitments detracting from the coherence of the Centre.

There is also editorial work related to publishing a quarterly academic journal that gives the researchers experience of peer reviewing and editing. PhD students are not involved in this, however, and the leadership could consider the educational potential of allowing students to run the journal (as is the case in some departments abroad). IPRI has also put on a number of training events, research seminars, thematic conferences. Overall there is an active research agenda and some strong outputs, but the group is also relatively large.

In terms of engagement, there is some with the public and Ministry of Foreign Affairs but impact is perhaps still thought of mainly through media appearances i.e. at arms length from societal stakeholders, although mention was made of summer schools in collaboration with municipalities.

Thus, consolidation of expansion and internationalisation of publications is important and better integration of PhD students in the Centre is a point in need of improvement (see below).

The Institute has a good balance of researchers with home-grown qualifications as well as outsiders that it is working to integrate. It employs a competitive, open hiring policy and has shown recently it is able to attract external researchers, most recently adding 14 in 2017, as well as PhD candidates from abroad, including Guiné Bissau, Benin and Iran. The plan to grow is ambitious and positive but requires more focused planning and support structures (see below).

The leadership comes across as well organised and intent on improving research output and internationalisation and succeeding in some respects to translate this into concrete measures that are supported by staff members. In terms of strategic visions, their proposed new focus area "Europe in the Aftermath" looks overall plausible, but the rationale and infrastructure for this could be clearer. How was this chosen and how is IPRI placed to become a European Studies Centre with international reference weight? It is also not clear why they plan annual conferences on Atlantic affairs and express the aim to continue publishing mainly in journals they already publish in.

PhDs in certain programmes need more integration into the work of the Unit; currently some appear to be arms length with ties to supervisor and department but not so much to the Unit. It was unclear what gain there was for them belonging to IPRI and in some cases it was unclear whether there were any connections beyond supervision (sporadic in some cases) and the bureaucratic exchanges every six months. The first year consists of course work but a support structure beyond this would alleviate current dependence on good-will and time of the supervisors. In terms of teaching experience, they are invited to give one or two lessons but this is also ad hoc. In terms of impact, there is no formalised training in public communication. There is scope for integrating them better in the projects and work of the Centre, including better doctoral studies support structures. Most are writing in Portuguese and we found no indication that they were being advised in this regard or in regard to publication outlet strategies. On the other hand they found it positive that they had the freedom to choose languages.

The description of future research plans contained a number of ambitious goals. For example, it is stated that IPRI aims to "significantly increase the number of publications in the most prestigious international peer-review journals and publishers. It intends to go from 34 (2017) to 110 articles in 2022". How precisely IPRI will ensure that this goal is reached remains unclear, including what concrete plans might be in place for supporting researchers in increasing their publications.

A second ambitious goal is to increase the number of PhD scholarship holders from 22 in 2017 to 55 in 2022, and the number of Post-Doctoral researchers from 6 to 24. This is a considerable expansion and it is not clear how well equipped are IPRI's current management structures are to cope with such rapid expansion. Attention needs to be paid to the PhD program, its fostering of international research quality and pastoral care. The plan to offer all Doctoral Programmes in English in future is also somewhat underdeveloped. To what extent is offering teaching in English within IPRI's current capacity? What specific human resources investments will be necessary to realise this goal?

In terms of other internationalisation aims, IPRI intends to triple its participation in international scientific networks (from 2 to 6). This appears a bit excessive although the research plan offers a bit more detail, describing concrete plans for deepening and expanding ties with existing partner institutions and research networks and for launching joint applications to major funding networks such as Horizon 2020, European Research Council and Marie Curie, etc.. Yet, IPRI's concrete role and envisaged activities within these networks/joint research projects is not specified in any detail.

In terms of future objectives, IPRI states a goal of strengthening its relationship with the public policy making world and increasing its presence in the public sphere. This seems important given IPRI's focus on European policy/economy. However, again there are no clear indications of how precisely this goal will be pursued.

Given IPRI's strong research focus on Europe and the recent economic crisis as well as the EU's role as a global actor, it would seem appropriate that attempts were made to pivot to focus on European studies and to secure EU funding for future research projects. The plan to organise annually an international conference entitled "Political Transformations of the Atlantic region", however, it does not obviously square with new proposed European focus.

In short, there are a number of laudable goals, but we do not feel that the report offers quite sufficient specific details on how these can/will be met.

Programmatic Funding, besides the hiring of a new (Junior) PhD Researcher is primarily for internationalization purposes and for facilitating publishing in international outlets.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Observatório de Relações Exteriores (OBSERVARE)

Coordinator: Luís Manuel Vítor Santos Moita

Integrated PhD Researchers: 29

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Observatory on Foreign Relations (OBSERVARE) originates from 1996 but was established as a R&D Unit in 2010 and adopted thematic foci on: a) war, peace and security, b) economic spaces and resource management, c) People and states in 2013. It has submitted an application to FCT with 29 integrated PhD researchers (47 integrated in all) and emphasises special contributions in research at the intersection of economic areas and security dynamics, international criminal justice, para-diplomacy and evolution of the nation state. Observare choses in the application to highlight in-house and locally published material, but there are also a few publications to be found from the integrated team that are published in internationally recognised outlets such as Management Studies, Millennium, Energy Efficiency, and International Journal of Organizational Leadership.

However, judged through the lens of FCT criteria of quality, merit, relevance and internationalisation, Observare research during the 2013-2017 period produced limited publications of weight for a R&D Centre of this size. There is a lot of home-published or otherwise institutionally hosted material, including in Janusnet and there are some smaller pieces (e.g. "commentaries") in external outlets. The latter may have positive elements from a national reference viewpoint, but as a whole, the rigour and internationalisation of the research is open to question, not least because as it has generally not been tested via external or international peer review processes. As expertise and R&D activities form the underlying basis for media and societal engagement and impact, that aspect of Observare contribution is correspondingly weakened.

The practical prioritizations of the leadership and senior researchers in this respect should be revisited. Janusnet may provide a facility for internal collaboration and contact to other Units, but pressure to fill own journal and book series and a plethora of conferences and workshops and (more of less well defined) partnerships may now be crowding out quality research activity and/or efforts to place research in places where it will be subject to qualified peer review and be taken up by other researchers. The Panel notes, for example, that four self-published books appeared in the time period under evaluation, presumably swallowing time and research efforts that might otherwise have produced work of recognized quality and merit.

Occasional book chapters do appear with international publishers, which is positive (Neves 2016, Sousa 2014) and more should be encouraged. Other material appears in international sites but then seems unrelated or only peripherally of relevance to the core thematic focus of the Center concerning international affairs (e.g. Brito 2015, Abreu & Tomé, V. 2017, Tomé 2017). Some articles and books e.g. Duarte (2017) may be substantial but do not appear in international outlets, though these may still have national or lusophone reach. A number of publications are in English but are not placed in academic outlets, e.g. in a handbook published by the Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria (Xavier and Rehr 2017). Other work at conferences and collaboration in international networks involves international collaboration but this does not generally sum up to significant output in terms of either research or policy impact. A majority of the members of the Centre cannot be said to have academic records for 2013-17 (according to Orchid pages) commensurate with a national or international reference Unit, which would be needed for Observare to be rated in criterion A "Good".

There is some promising material appearing after the evaluation period (in 2018) and some in the pipeline, including material destined for Springer and Palgrave Macmillan. Some future projects also sound promising, e.g one on Portugal external image and on European defence. There are plans for a major international conference on the Middle East and

Eurasia. It is not clear, however that the overall plans (see below) amount to an adequate strategy to move the Unit qualitatively up in merit and relevance.

Observare PhD in International Relations: Geopolitics and Geoeconomics is related to some of Observare research activities, and the integration of the doctoral students appears to be working. The leadership and supervision of the PhD students is to be commended. There is a Masters Degrees in War and Peace Studies and one in International Relations, and most member of the team are active teachers at the department, some with heavy teaching loads.

The thematic foci of the Unit are initially clearly stated by the leadership, and there is an aspiration to increase internationalisation and the integration of foreign researchers. The doctoral program combining geopolitics and geoeconomics is distinctive and well reviewed by PhD students. There is also focus on interdisciplinarity and collaboration with foreign R&D Units which is to be applauded, although care should be taken to choose collaborations that lead to significant research products and/or outreach to societal stakeholders and constituencies. More focus ought to be placed on spurring researchers to produce and publish high quality and internationally available research as opposed to mainly publishing the outputs of others (through the JANUS journals) or 'self-publishing' own researchers material, as it were.

The team is challenged in terms of aligning goals with activities, i.e. the declared aims of being an international R&D Unit focused squarely on war and security, geopolitics and economics, and to publish more internationally are not squared by appropriate actions to bring this about. There is a tradition for in-house publishing which appears to be seen as a priority by the researchers despite the aim of increasing publications in peer-reviewed international journals. The patterns of interaction, despite numerous networks, remain too insular seeking feedback and peer review amongst familiar communities, rather than from a wider or international academic field. At the visit, several researchers insisted on speaking Portuguese or French despite demonstrably speaking good English, undermining the impression that this is a R&D Centre determined to internationalise and facilitate the translation and transmission of Portuguese angles into wider debates.

Approximately half the team are full professors. If the amount of time available for research is a contributing factor to reduced international quality publications, this might be addressed by prioritising more discerningly among competing activities (including domestic conferences) or by rewarding productive researchers with lower teaching burdens. Focusing help more effectively where needed on language assistance is also worth considering in order to capitalise better on any rigorous Portuguese produced material, also allowing this to be tested and shared among non-lusophone audiences where appropriate.

Among the strategic objectives of Observare-UAL for 2018-2022 are: a) to increase the impact factor of the scientific journal JANUS.NET; b) to enlarge the advanced training offer; c) to improve scientific work methods; and d) to increase the number of scientific articles published in top-tier international journals. Of these d) seems particularly important if the Unit is to achieve its overall goal of raising its national and international profile. Yet it is important to clarify how expanded training offers and intensifying work on JANUSNET will be compatible with/help to support an increased focus on high quality international research.

Given the effort put into producing it, the goal to boost the impact factor of Janusnet is sensible on its own terms, though it could be more clearly set out in methods. For instance, the proposed increase in the number of editions from two to three per year would cost scarce labour resources and may well lower the impact factor by spreading quality more thinly. Other methods traditionally used to augment impact factors (faster reviewing processes, quality peer reviewers, better visibility etc.) are not considered (in the application at least). The laudable aim to improve scientific method and fieldwork could also be better spelled out in actionable plans.

The aim to boost English scientific publication is positive, but is envisioned to be achieved in part through "already approved incentive policy, namely through funding of English revision and translation". The point that there is an already approved incentive to publish in more appropriate journals is left unspecified (what is the incentive and support to do so?) and it is unclear that this incentive by itself is sufficient to meet stated goals, as evidenced by the relative lack of international publications since 2013. At the same time, some of the other proposed initiatives would work in the opposite direction, such as increasing publication in YANUSNET and organising many more conferences. These are at best an uncertain route to boost English language publications. Co-authorship with other universities could serve to increase research output and publication but evidence of this has been scant in the preceding phase.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: RATIO LEGIS - Centro de Investigação e desenvolvimento em ciências Jurídicas (RATIO LEGIS)

Coordinator: Paulo Jorge Nogueira da Costa

Integrated PhD Researchers: 21

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Centro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Ciências Jurídicas Ratio Legis (Ratio Legis, or the Centre) is headed by a young researcher from Spain – the first R&D Unit Coordinator from outside Portugal we encountered. Thus, this evaluation starts on a positive note for diversity which, however, was not reflected in the gender balance. Gender was an issue as the Panellists read the application and this was made very visible during our site visit: the main presenters were male and few women were present in the room. Also, the sharp absence of language skills among several PhD students was a phenomenon which the Panel did not encounter elsewhere. Finally, the Panel was not impressed by the output of the Centre over the past five years which, moreover, focused on Portuguese-language publications and one English-language book only. This led to an overall score of 2 in criterion A.

Ratio Legis has grown in the last cycle, up from 13 to 32 researchers, and growth is the strategy moving forward and the rationale for funding. The Centre hopes to hire 8 more researchers through the next cycle. The Centre is part of the UAL, it does not have separate legal personality, and both are managed by a non-profit cooperative.

An important development that the Panel learned of is that the Centre has recently reached an agreement with the Faculty of Law so that researchers teach maximum 9 hours per week going forward (effective this academic year, so a recent development): this will permit a heavier focus on research, which the Panel appreciates. Since UAL is a private institution, there is a heavy focus on teaching - only one integrated researcher can dedicate her/his full time to research. Creating a more robust body of scientific work will be important for this Centre going forward.

The focus of research cooperation seems to be with Spanish (notably, Galician – perhaps due to the origin of the chair) and Brazilian researchers. Again, the internationalisation of Ratio Legis leaves much to be desired for.

In the past period, Ratio Legis has focused on two main strands of research: (1) "Freedom, Security and Justice", with the project "Religious Liberty, Risk and Security in the 21st Century" and (2) "Market, Regulation Taxation" with the Economic Regulation project.

The Panel raised questions about the temporary discontinuation of Ratio Legis publication Galileu and expressed its concern for continued dissemination of research results. The Panel emphasised the need for publishing in peer-reviewed journals.

The Panel noted the associations with Coimbra: Ius Gentium Conimbrigae Research Centre/Human Rights Centre (IGC/HRC), Coimbra, (<http://igc.fd.uc.pt/en/default.asp>) and with Para, Brazil: Instituto de Ciências Jurídicas (<http://www.icj.ufpa.br/>); <https://portal.ufpa.br/>, with 20 lectures/seminars organised, on law & health, sustainable development, the Portuguese Court of Auditors (Ratio Legis coordinator Paulo Jorge Nogueira Da Costa is a jurist at this Tribunal) and the Panama Papers. The Panel could not establish the quality of the Para university link, comparatively to other Brazilian universities.

One significant impression was the strong focus on Brazil. The Centre hopes to be the interlocutor between Brazil and the EU and hosts a number of Brazilian students. It discussed a strategy of beginning to identify and form partnerships with a wider range of universities.

One notable project that the Panel found out more about during the site visit concerns the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled Persons in Portugal. The Centre has adopted an interdisciplinary approach, establishing contracts with collaborating researchers from sociology so as to develop surveys and focus groups as well as an application for the blind. They have published four articles and organized an international conference thus far. The goal is to train diverse stakeholders and educators as well as to put forward legislative reform and ultimately, empower disabled people. The Panel was deeply appreciative of this project, which seems important for social impact - one of the most innovative initiatives we heard about from this Centre. We would like to especially note the passionate researcher, Miguel Santos Neves, and strongly suggest that the Centre considers applying for special funding for his project. This is clearly: "Law in action".

Another standout was the work and passion of Maria Constança Urbano de Sousa (Member of the Portuguese Parliament and former Minister of Home Affairs) who has recently joined the Centre and is working to break the nexus between security and migration as well as the human rights of migrants. This issue was flagged because the application spoke of "crimmigration" – a term introduced in the application by a researcher who was not present and the Panel was rather concerned with this discourse. It seems that the Centre has a focus on vulnerable persons but the terms used for these strands of research seem to reflect an artificial link between immigration and crime. This issue was clarified by the Portuguese MP researcher who indicated no such intentions are implied in the research undertaken.

We noted that the scope of outreach in other languages than Portuguese depends on the researchers included: Spanish, German and English were spoken by some but of the four PhD researchers we met, two needed simultaneous translation (!) to communicate with us in English. This necessarily influenced our ranking of the team, in spite of several jewels in Ratio Legis's crown.

A special mention also goes to the Rector of the Faculty, José Amado do Silva, who came to see us and shared that he reads all PhD theses, also not in his own field – something which impressed a lot – even though it is not of direct relevance to the evaluation of Ratio Legis.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Law and Political Science

R&D Unit: Teoria e História do Direito - Centro de Investigação da ULisboa (THD-ULisboa)

Coordinator: Eduardo Augusto Alves Vera-Cruz Pinto

Integrated PhD Researchers: 14

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The main concern with the Centre is that whilst it clearly is involved in many activities relating to the subject area, it is difficult to see what specifically counts as Rresearch. The first main achievement cited by the Centre over the five-year is a Facebook page and Youtube channel, which is very strange for a R&D Centre at a leading national University. The Centre appears focused on collecting historically relevant material and publishing it rather than research. It was difficult to ascertain the exact scientific output, but it is clear the Centre is trying some outreach forms such as YouTube channel. There were some innovative practices noted: a 10 series documentary on the evolution of the law and the use of sign language in future dissemination of work. There was a specific request to get funding for translation and revision services in English (which has been requested).

However, while outreach is important, it is not sufficient from the perspective of the scientific research to collect materials. For instance, the Centre has published a collection related to A. Viera – 30 volumes in total – which is important for the history of Portugal and Brazil, but it is difficult to ascertain specific research impact of this work as the Panel understands it from the criteria of the FCT. The highlighted publications were largely the single or co-authored works of one of the senior researchers, which did not therefore demonstrate a breadth of research undertaken by the Centre members as a whole.

The most extensive work being conducted by THD ULisboa, which are works still in progress, are the Encyclopaedia of the History of Portuguese Legal Culture and the Atlas of the History of Portuguese Legal Culture in the World. These are huge undertakings and require a number of field trips all over the world; the handling of aged, fragile documentation; and a large number of interviews. The potential output from these two projects is not clear at this stage but appears to have societal relevance. The idea is that these materials can be made available online is a potentially valuable one and the Panel suggest seeking institutional support from the Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs that might facilitate access to researchers at a political level. Collecting these documents, testimonials and digitizing them is already a huge project, but the scientific analysis – which requires comparative legal analysis knowledge – is another massive undertaking. The Panel suggests that the Centre seeks specific project financing here for this important, ambitious project.

The Centre has an impressive number of relevant speakers coming to the Centre, including judge Trindade who lectured at the Centre and who is participating in one of the projects of the Centre. PhD researchers clearly benefit from visiting professors, some of whom visit from a longer period to give a short course (e.g. M Koskenniemi) rather than simply for a single lecture. The Centre includes members who have developed an international reputation and the compliments by external advisors were noted.

The Centre was one of the coorganisers of the world congress of the international association for the philosophy of law and social philosophy (IVR). Though the organization of the IVR 2017 (which we were told was undertaken under less than desirable circumstances since the conference was meant to take place in Istanbul) involved the Centre, the three Lisbon hosts who are thanked in the welcome of the publication (Prof. Jos_ Brito, Prof. Gulriz Uygur, Prof. Ioanna Kucuradi) seem not to appear as Integrated Researchers in the application.

It was difficult for the Panel to see how internationalisation is understood within the Centre. There were several projects mentioned, such as research on the legal status of slaves, which are being conducted and written in Portuguese only. The Panel in no way wish to criticise the intention to share the research with other Portuguese-speaking countries, but

in subjects where there is clear relevance in other countries too. Thought should be given to publishing in other languages (particularly English). None of the highlighted selected publications were in languages other than Portuguese. The Panel found that there was a lack of strategy in making the work of the Centre more prominent in the wider world, even though internationalisation is a key component of the funding programme, and therefore supporting the future development of research capacity within the Centre (particularly amongst junior researchers and PhD students). Considering the scarcity of resources but yet the strength of the international network promoted by the Centre, one strategy the Centre might consider in the future is multi-author work, including with authors beyond the Centre and internationally. This might also help a strategy of publishing work in leading, international journals too.

PhD students noted the ability to approach senior members as an advantage of being part of the Centre. PhD researchers stressed the relevance of using primary sources in research, thereby justifying reprints of original texts (as opposed to research). It was not clear to the Panel however why work with primary sources cannot be complemented with additional research, which cast doubt on how the Centre as a whole considers different ways of approaching research, particularly towards work destined for peer-reviewed publications. There therefore appeared to be some doubt about methodology when working towards international-focused publications. The contribution made by the Centre in terms of its contribution to advanced training was not fully clear to the Panel. However, the Centre mentioned an increasing number of MA and PhD students and there is a considerable number of new areas of postgraduate study. This evidences a keen interest and a role for Portugal in the legal market for the history of law education, which the Panel hopes the Centre will be able to capitalise on in the future.

Concerning the value added by the Centre, the Centre organizes international conferences which brings high level foreign professionals to PhD students and gives them opportunities to present their work. The network of the Centre provides the students with access to important libraries (Bologna, Heidelberg, Bergamo) and for some, mobility to present their work abroad. A similar sentiment was expressed by the junior researchers that the value added by the Centre is the connection with other researchers and networks. With this in mind, the rating by the Panel is higher for criteria B than A.

There appeared to be an appropriate gender balance between leadership of the various parts of the Centre projects and work.

The future plans of the Centre were set out across six areas, with 6 PhD researchers to join the Centre across three different programmes and 4 new researchers. The Panel believes that whilst scholarship in these areas is highly important and relevant in this subject area, under criterion A the Centre was characterised with a rating 2 (weak) ("R&D Unit with few Integrated PhD Researchers having performed R&D of national and international quality and merit, and the other researchers having performed R&D of limited quality and merit in one or more areas of activity"). Therefore and regrettably in the light of the findings on the work of the Centre over the past 5 years, the Panel doubts whether the ambitious plans would be capable of being realised by a relatively small team who had not sufficiently demonstrated that the required level of coherence, leadership and strategy and the ability to run projects leading to successful outputs.

Other matters – special mentions

André Moz Caldas, a PhD student, who is currently the Head of Staff to the President of the Eurogroup was particularly impressive in presenting an understanding of the connection of the past to shaping the future of policy. Also very impressive was a junior researcher, Ana Caldeira Fouto, who took the lead in presenting aspects of the Centre. Claudia Duarte, who has a Scholarship BGCT is responsible for the online materials, videos, YouTube and the online content of the Centre deserves a special mention for her work.