

Committee Guidelines

Table of Contents

1. The EMBO Global Investigator Network	3
1.1. About	3
1.2. Summary of benefits	3
2. The EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee	4
2.1. Terms of reference	4
2.2. Tasks of the Committee	5
2.3. EMBO Conflict of Interest Policy	5
2.4. Confidentiality	5
2.5. Data protection	6
3. Selection procedures	6
3.1. Overview	6
Timeline 2025	8
3.2. Pre-selection	8
Pre-selection scoring key	8
3.3. External assessment	9
3.4. Assignment to committee members	9
3.5. Committee meeting and interviews	9
4. Evaluation and feedback	10
4.1. Evaluation criteria	10
4.2. Scoring system	12
4.3. Feedback guidelines	12
TRACK RECORD	12
RESEARCH	13

GROUP AND RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT	15
INDEPENDENCE	15
Annex I: EMBO Conflict of Interest Policy	17
Annex II: Code of Conduct for EMBO Committees	18

Gerlind Wallon, Programme Head
gerlind.wallon@embo.org

Leonor Ruivo, Programme Officer
leonor.ruivo@embo.org

Tiffany Myers, Programme Assistant
tiffany.myers@embo.org

Application deadline: 1 May annually

EMBC/EMBO Partners: Chile, India, Taiwan, Singapore

EMBO subject areas:

Cell Cycle, Cell & Tissue Architecture, Cellular Metabolism, Chromatin & Transcription, Development, Differentiation & Death, Evolution & Ecology, Genome Stability & Dynamics, Genomic & Computational Biology, Immunology, Membranes & Transport, Microbiology, Virology & Pathogens, Molecular Medicine, Neuroscience, Plant Biology, Proteins & Biochemistry, RNA, Signal Transduction, Structural Biology & Biophysics, Systems Biology

Contact: global@embo.org

EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee 2025:

Angela Falciatore (FR)
 Cayetano González (ES) (Chair)
 Hedda Wardemann (DE)
 Rosa Cossart (FR)
 Toni Gabaldón (ES)
 Alwin Köhler (AT)
 Ilaria Malanchi (UK)
 Ruth Massey (IE)
 Christoph Müller (DE)
 Wim Vermeulen (NL)

1. The EMBO Global Investigator Network

1.1. About

The EMBO Global Investigator Network supports innovative and creative group leaders producing impactful research in the Life Sciences and who, at the time of application, are within their first six years of setting up their research group in Chile, India, Singapore, or Taiwan.

Global Investigators receive financial support for four years for training and networking activities, providing them with opportunities to form collaborations with scientists in their region and in Europe. They become part of an international network of more than 700 current and former EMBO Young Investigators, Global Investigators, and Installation Grantees.

The programme selects 8 to 10 new investigators annually. Selected researchers have full benefit of all programme activities for four years and are referred to as **current programme members** during this period. After these four years, they will be referred to as **former programme members** but will remain associated with the network and have access to some of its benefits.

Programme members are selected based on their intellectual independence, originality of their research topic and/or methodological approaches, and whose work will lead to major contributions in their field.

1.2. Summary of benefits

Funds are available for EMBO Global Investigators for:

- Visiting other research institutions to give a scientific seminar or to plan or continue a collaboration
- Training in research leadership and management skills through EMBO Lab Leadership Courses
- Inviting researchers to give scientific lectures at their institute
- Delivering national lecture series
- Sending members of their research group to another laboratory to carry out experiments or learn a technique
- Accessing EMBL core facilities

- Organising joint group meetings with other laboratories
- Attending or organizing regional or international scientific meetings
- Attending EMBO Young Investigator Network annual meetings
- Arranging a lab retreat
- Covering fees for publications in EMBO Press journals
- Childcare support when attending conferences
- Manuscript and grant proposal editing services
- Professional development courses

These activities and their conditions are detailed in the Global Investigator Network [Programme Guide](#) and are subject to change.

2. The EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee

2.1. Terms of reference

EMBO committees act in an advisory role to EMBO Council. The authority to make decisions on the funding of applications to the EMBO Global Investigator Network has been delegated by EMBO Council to the EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee.

The EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee comprises 10 EMBO Members with different areas of scientific expertise. Committee members normally serve a four-year term. The Global Investigator Network Committee suggests replacements for outgoing committee members and the suggested names are submitted to EMBO Council for appointment. New committee members are invited by the EMBO Global Activities office.

The Chair of the committee is selected by the committee (normally a current member with some experience on this committee), and the proposed name is brought to EMBO Council for appointment. The chair serves a term of three years in addition to the number of years they have already served on the committee. When a chair finishes their term, the committee members will be asked by written procedure to propose a new chairperson. Only proposals received by written procedure prior to the committee meeting can be voted upon.

The Global Investigator Network Committee meets once per year to interview the top candidates to the programme and make the final selection. All proposals are confidential until they are approved by the Global Investigator Network Committee and publicly announced.

All travel and accommodation expenses incurred by the committee members attending committee meetings are covered by EMBO.

2.2. Tasks of the Committee

The Global Investigator Network Committee is responsible for the selection of EMBO Global Investigators. About 50 applications are received annually, and 8 to 10 new EMBO Global Investigators per year are selected.

The [evaluation](#) of the applications includes a pre-selection stage performed remotely and an interview with the top ranked candidates. Committee members are requested to attend the Committee meeting and interviews in person. The candidates attend the interviews online.

The committee receives an annual report summarising the programme's activities.

2.3. EMBO Conflict of Interest Policy

Committee members are asked to indicate, prior to their involvement in the evaluation process, any real or perceived conflict of interest that may arise in assessing any of the candidates. Please take note of EMBO's Conflict of Interest Policy in [Annex I](#).

The following situations may arise for Global Investigator Network Committee members:

Situation	Level of conflict	Consequence
Being an advisor of the applicant	High	Excluded from review process*
Being an active collaborator with the applicant or having collaborated during the previous five years	High	Excluded from review process*
Being a partner of the applicant	High	Excluded from review process*
Having a PhD or postdoctoral/training relationship with the applicant now or during the previous five years	High	Excluded from review process*
Working in same institution/university	High	Excluded from review process*
Having a financial interest in the application	High	Excluded from review process*

*Cannot be assigned as the primary reviewer of the proposal and cannot participate in the discussions related to that particular application (needs to leave the room while the discussion takes place). For any questions about a potential conflict of interest, please contact the Global Activities office.

2.4. Confidentiality

Strict confidentiality is expected regarding all applications. Information received during the review process and the committee meeting should not be relayed to third parties. Please see [Annex II](#) for further details on the Code of Conduct for EMBO Committees.

2.5. Data protection

Committee members must destroy any personal data provided to them for the purpose of a selection (application files including references, etc.) within six months after the conclusion of the respective selection procedure. Please see [Annex II](#) for further details.

3. Selection procedures

3.1. Overview

About 50 applications are received annually. The Global Activities office screens the applications to ensure that they are complete and the eligibility requirements are met.

Eligibility criteria checked by the office

- Applicants should have been an independent group leader for at least one year and for less than six years on 1 January in the year of application. EMBO defines an independent researcher as someone who conceives and pursues their own research ideas with their own funding and research team.
- Applicants must perform research in the life sciences (see [EMBO subject areas](#)) in Chile, India, Taiwan or Singapore.
- Applicants must have published at least one senior author research paper in an international peer reviewed journal from independent work carried out in their own research group.
 - A senior author is a researcher who played a critical leadership role in the research project. Senior authorship signifies leadership and ultimate accountability for the research, reflecting a pivotal role in guiding and supporting the scientific work. This author is typically the group leader who conceptualized the original research idea; secured funding for the project; supervised the research team; provided critical guidance and intellectual direction; and ensured the scientific and ethical standards of the work.
- A senior author preprint with public in-depth peer reviews is accepted at the application stage provided the following conditions are met:
 - The preprint is posted on a recognized community preprint server such as Arxiv, bioRxiv, medRxiv, Zenodo;
 - The peer reviews must be publicly available online;
 - The peer reviews were verifiably obtained from an independent preprint peer review service such as “Peer Community In”, “eLife” or “Review Commons”;
 - The reviews provide an in-depth expert analysis of the rigor and validity of the research and its contribution to the field.
- International experience and networks are considered a plus.
- Applicants can only be interviewed twice by the selection committee.

Please note:

- Senior author research papers that are “in submission” by the application deadline are accepted. Review articles are not considered.
- For female candidates with children, the limit of six-years since independence is automatically extended by one year per child.
- For male applicants with children, the limit can be extended by the actual time taken off as paternity leave or – if their partner is working at least 80% FTE (full-time equivalent) – 3 months per child, whichever is longer.
- Illness, extended military service, and care responsibilities are considered as exceptional circumstances on a case-by-case basis. Special provision may also be made for clinical scientists.

The evaluation of the applications by the EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee includes a pre-selection stage performed remotely and a personal interview with the top ranked candidates. Please refer to the [pre-selection scoring key](#) and to the [evaluation criteria and scoring system](#).

The committee pre-selects around 20 candidates, who are invited to attend an online interview. The committee is divided into two groups who each interview around 10 candidates.

Each pre-selected application is also sent for written review to an EMBO Member with expertise in the candidate's area of research to provide an additional assessment to the committee.

The final decision is made at the end of the interview day, and candidates are notified of the outcome of their application by email. Annually, 8 to 10 new EMBO Global Investigators are selected.

Timeline 2025

Relevant dates to the committee members are indicated in bold.

Deadline for applications	1 May
Application files sent to the committee	15 May
Deadline for scoring applications	20 June
Pre-selected applicants invited to interviews	By 30 June
Committee meeting (online)	14 November
Interviews	17 & 18 November
Results announced to applicants	By 5 December

3.2. Pre-selection

Each application is sent to four committee members for evaluation and ranking. Depending on the total number of applications received, each committee member is assigned approximately 20-25 candidates. Any real or perceived conflicts of interest should be declared immediately so that the applications can be re-assigned.

Committee members receive a secure web link to download the applications as PDF files within two weeks after the application deadline. Each application file contains:

- A cover page including a short version of the CV, details of the three scientists providing letters of reference, a summary of the research plan and details of research group members and funding available.
- An application form including the full CV, list of publications, details of the applicant's three best papers, and a three-page description of the applicant's research.
- A short description of the host institute's facilities relevant to the applicant's research.
- A short description of how the applicant plans to make the most of the networking grant.
- Three letters of reference. Please note that reference letters submitted to the EMBO Young Investigator Programme can be re-used for the Global Investigator Network if requested by the applicant.

Pre-selection scoring key

Applications should be scored as follows. Please also refer to the [evaluation criteria](#).

A: strong candidate for interview, considered to be either:

- **Excellent** – a mature scientist; clear evidence for leadership within their specific field, an independent scientist with clear signs of original thinking and vision, or
- **Outstanding** – a highly mature scientist; a demonstrable leader in their specific and related fields; clearly a highly independent and original thinker with a compelling vision.

B: potential candidate for interview, considered to show evidence for emerging maturity and leadership; some evidence for original thinking and emerging vision.

C: not strong enough to interview, considered to show insufficient scientific maturity, vision and original thinking not well developed.

D: weak candidate considered to lack scientific maturity, lack of vision and original thinking.

Scores are expected from committee members by **20 June 2025**. Based on the scores received, and in consultation with the Committee Chair, the Global Activities office draws up a list of approximately 20 top ranked candidates who will be invited to the interviews.

3.3. External assessment

For each pre-selected application, an EMBO Member with expertise in the applicant's area of research is requested to provide a written confidential assessment of the candidate, focusing on their standing in the field and the feasibility of the proposed work.

3.4. Assignment to committee members

Each committee member is assigned to one of two panels and participates in the interview of around 10 candidates. Ahead of the meeting, the Global Activities office sends all committee members a list of candidates to be interviewed together with the external assessment reports.

Each member is assigned as a **primary interviewer** for one to three applicants. In this role, they lead the discussion on the candidate during the committee meeting, i.e., give a short summary of the candidate's application, credentials, suitability of the work environment, external reviewer's comments, and point out potential issues to be explored.

Any real or perceived conflicts of interest regarding particular applications should be declared prior to the final primary interviewer assignments.

3.5. Committee meeting and interviews

In preparation for the interviews, the EMBO Global Investigator Network Committee meeting takes place virtually on 14 November 2025 between 10:00 am and 12:00 pm CET.

Committee members are invited to EMBO in Heidelberg (Germany) on 17 & 18 November 2025 for a day and a half of selection interviews. Interviews are conducted by the two panels in

parallel. Each candidate joins remotely and has a 30-minute time slot: 10 minutes to present their work followed by 10 minutes for questions. The remaining 10 minutes are reserved for the committee to discuss the application and provide a preliminary ranking in comparison to other candidates already interviewed.

After the interviews, the committee members compare and discuss the rankings and make the final selection of EMBO Global Investigators (please refer to the [Evaluation criteria and scoring system](#)). Committee members are asked to provide feedback to their respective rejected primary candidates. Candidates are informed of the outcome of their application by email.

4. Evaluation and feedback

4.1. Evaluation criteria

EMBO is looking for the best and most promising independent researchers that have recently established their research group in Chile, India, Singapore, and Taiwan and who are actively contributing towards knowledge production. Although a geographically balanced set of selected network members is desirable, the primary selection criterion applied by all EMBO Committees is scientific excellence.

Committee members should keep in mind that EMBO is a signatory of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and as such does not use publication metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor during the assessment process (see <https://sfdora.org> for further details). Applicants are asked NOT to include publication metrics in their publication list.

In addition to the context in which they perform research, the following aspects of each application shall be evaluated in all phases of the evaluation process:

TRACK RECORD

Criteria for evaluating the track record:

- Scientific achievements and professional development to date: Are they an indication that this is an outstanding scientist?
- Scientific breadth and depth: Does the candidate have a thorough understanding of their field and the implications of their research beyond; Has the applicant shown the ability to tackle new and important problems?
- International experience and networks are considered an asset: Has the candidate carried out research abroad or, alternatively, established diverse collaborations?

RESEARCH

Criteria for evaluating the research:

- Hypothesis-driven project plan: Does the proposed research stand on a solid, hypothesis-driven plan while remaining ambitious in the field?
- Ambition: Is the proposed research original and likely to lead to novel contributions in the field?
- Potential for leadership: Does the applicant have the potential to become a future leader in their field, being recognized for their scientific contributions?

GROUP AND RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Criteria for evaluating the group and research environment:

- Group size and funding sources: Are the number and the expertise of research group members and the available funds sufficient to undertake the described research?
- Host institute: Is the research environment supportive of the candidate's research, e.g. equipment, funding, relevant colleagues, etc?

INDEPENDENCE

Criteria for evaluating the candidate's independence:

- Operational independence:
 - Is the candidate financially independent, able to apply for grants in their own name, and report directly to funding agencies?
 - Is the candidate able to submit manuscripts as senior author ("corresponding author" is not necessarily considered equivalent to "senior author").
 - Is the candidate responsible for supervising graduate students and/or postdocs in their own lab?
- Intellectual independence:
 - Is the candidate conceiving and independently pursuing their own research ideas?
 - What is the influence of former supervisors and institute heads on the candidate's current research?

CANDIDATE'S PERFORMANCE DURING THE INTERVIEW

Criteria for evaluating the candidate's response to questions:

- Maturity:
 - Does the candidate have a solid understanding of the background, being able to place their work within a broader context?
 - Does the candidate address the questions appropriately, showing strategic thinking?
- Clarity of communication:
 - Does the candidate present their research project in a clear and logical manner?
 - Does the candidate communicate clearly how their discoveries will shed light on other important questions in biology?

4.2. Scoring system

At the end of each candidate's interview and discussion, panel members assign a score from 1 to 5 (with 5 being the best) to each evaluation criterion – a scoring sheet is provided. At this stage, the candidates being interviewed are those who the committee evaluated at the pre-screen stage as *Very good (B)*, *Excellent* or *Outstanding (A)*.

This 1 to 5 scoring scheme can be a useful exercise for those applications where consensus is more difficult, the so-called grey zone that occupies much of the committee's efforts with final rankings. Those applications that are clearly supportable or non-supportable are more typically binary 'yes' or 'no' decisions. To facilitate the selection of the most suitable awardees, and given that interviewed candidates have been pre-selected and should have therefore scored 3 or more, decimals in 0.5 increments can be used when scoring them.

While scoring candidates from 1 to 5, please consider the [evaluation criteria](#) and the context of the candidate being evaluated. Please note that adjustments can be made to calibrate the scores as more candidates are interviewed.

The following definition of each score is suggested and can be discussed before the interviews:

- **5 - Outstanding** - a highly mature scientist; a demonstrable leader in their specific and related fields; clearly a highly independent and original thinker with a compelling vision.
- **4 - Excellent** - a mature scientist; clear evidence for leadership within their specific field, an independent scientist with clear signs of original thinking and vision.
- **3 - Very good** - evidence for emerging maturity and leadership; some evidence for original thinking and emerging vision.
- **2 - Good** - insufficient scientific maturity, vision and original thinking not well developed - *not supportable for an award*.
- **1 - Non-competitive** - lacks scientific maturity, lack of vision and original thinking - *not supportable for an award*.

4.3. Feedback guidelines

Based on the evaluation criteria, below are examples of feedback that can be provided based on the candidates' performance.

TRACK RECORD

The applicant

Positive	Negative
Has a good first author publication record from their training	Is mostly the middle author
Has changed research area	Publishes mostly in specialist journals

Has shown the ability and ambition to tackle new and important problems	Has remained in the same field throughout their entire career
	Has not shown any interest beyond their established field/research area

The research carried out by the candidate in the past has led to

Positive	Negative
A breakthrough	Confirmatory evidence in the field
A significant advance	

The track record

Positive	Negative
Is outstanding	Does not meet the expectations for an EMBO Young Investigator (e.g., impact and quality of research produced so far; number and/or quality of first/senior author publications)
Is very good	

RESEARCH

The research

Positive	Negative
Is a novel project distinct from the PhD/post doctoral projects.	Is a straightforward continuation of the PhD/post doctoral project
Evolved from post doctoral work into an independent and original line of research	
Is ambitious and beyond the state of the art	The presented research projects lack ambition, i.e. do not lead beyond the obvious next steps. The committee would have liked to see X and Y
Is a cross-disciplinary project(s)	
Has a focused aim and a clear list of questions to be explored	The presented research is unfocused and addresses too many questions, such as X, Y, and Z. A focus on the main question X is recommended
Includes the development of novel concepts and approaches	The proposal is mostly descriptive in x or y, and it does not include the development of novel concepts or approaches within/for Z.

Will lead to novel insights in the field	
Addresses an important question(s) in the field	Addresses questions that are mainstream, such as X, Y, and Z
	Is mainly technology-driven and lacks a focused biological question
Requires novel methodology that is being developed by the team	See section on “Group and research environment”
Requires novel methodology that is provided by a collaborator	See section on “Group and research environment”
Is original and realistic	The hypothesis x is not supported by pilot data or the work of others (possibly describe hypothesis and data criticised)
	Proposes methods that are not suitable for testing the stated hypothesis possibly describe hypothesis and data criticised)
	Proposal is premature given the current state of the project(s) (describe the shortcomings of the current state)
	Is proposing an approach that is likely to fail because...

The candidate

Positive	Negative
Has demonstrated the ability to carry out groundbreaking research in the past	Mainly worked on mainstream topics
Has developed a unique niche	Works in a highly competitive field without having developed their own specific niche
Has demonstrated the potential to become a leader in their field	
Has demonstrated the ability to think creatively	
Appears mature and strategic	

GROUP AND RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Positive	Negative
The group is sufficiently funded to carry out the project(s)	The financial resources to address X and Y are insufficient to carry out the project as proposed.
The research group has demonstrated experience/expertise in the field	The research group does not have a sufficient level of experience/expertise to address questions X or Y.
The research group has a collaboration with a critical expert	
The research group has the appropriate size to carry out the project(s)	The size of the research group is not sufficient to carry out the project(s) (in relation to X or Y).
The research group is embedded in an environment where their research will thrive	The research environment is not conducive to competitive research and a successful conclusion of the research projects. The institute has no expertise/equipment to carry out X or Y.

INDEPENDENCE

Positive	Negative
The candidate is intellectually and financially independent	The candidate does not have financial independence to complete the project(s)
	The candidate does not supervise own PhD students
	The proposed research is under too much intellectual influence from former supervisor
	The proposed research is under too much intellectual influence by the head of the institute/department

CANDIDATE'S PERFORMANCE DURING THE INTERVIEW

Presentation

Positive	Negative
Very clear and well structured	Presentation was not well structured
	Slides were overloaded
Gave a succinct but comprehensive introduction to the project	Presented too much background

	Presentation lacked sufficient background to justify X and Y
	The results presented did not sufficiently support the interpretation given...
The candidate provided a good overview of their research portfolio	Narrow focus of work presented. The research portfolio was not mentioned, and the context did not become clear.
	The presentation lacked experimental detail, particularly in relation to X and Y
	Questions to be addressed were not clearly defined
Nicely put their work in context with the work of others	Did not demonstrate novelty compared to previous work in this area.
Clearly explained the fundamental hypothesis/biological question	The fundamental hypothesis/biological question did not become clear, the committee would have liked to hear more about x or y
Preliminary data was presented clearly	No preliminary data presented
	Presentation did not to clarify the link among the projects presented
	Presentation did not adequately clarify the goal of the project

Candidate's responses to questions

Positive	Negative
Demonstrated background knowledge	Lacked sufficient background knowledge, e.g. in the area of...
Responses were mature and strategic	Responses were not mature and strategic
Responses addressed the questions appropriately	Responses did not address the questions appropriately, more specifically the candidate could not explain X.
Communicated clearly how the discoveries will shed light on other important questions in biology	Did not communicate how the discoveries will shed light on other important questions in biology, such as X.
Put work within the broader context	Did not put work within the broader context

Annex I: EMBO Conflict of Interest Policy

EMBO is supported by several expert committees in the evaluation of applications or nominations submitted to any of its programmes and activities. The task of the evaluator is to ensure the confidential, fair, and equitable peer review of the submissions. In this capacity the evaluator shall work independently and not represent any organization. The evaluators commit themselves to strict confidentiality and impartiality for this task and shall not discuss the proposal with anyone not directly involved with the peer review of the candidate/proposal.

Persons who are involved in the evaluation of applications or nominations submitted to any of the EMBO programmes and activities shall declare to the EMBO Office any conflict of interest in relation to any candidate or proposal prior to their involvement in an evaluation. Persons with a conflict of interest will be exempt from the review, evaluation, and decision-making process for the evaluation in question.

Conflicts of interest include:

1. Having a personal relationship with the candidate or proposer, or, in the case of a fellowship applicant, with the future supervisor/host.
2. Having supervised the candidate for a PhD degree or as a postdoctoral researcher.
3. Having a significant academic relationship with the candidate, or in the case of a fellowship applicant, with the future supervisor/host; this includes having jointly published a research paper in the last five years.
4. Being a member of the candidate's department or institution.
5. Having a current or planned close scientific cooperation.
6. Having commercial/financial interests in relation to the candidate/proposal.
7. Having been involved in the preparation of the proposal.
8. Benefitting directly or indirectly from the acceptance or rejection of the proposal/candidate (i.e. direct competition).
9. Being in any other situation that could cast doubt on the evaluator's ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

Annex II: Code of Conduct for EMBO Committees

EMBO is committed to ethical and responsible decision-making, responsible conduct of research and the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). These principles inform the work of our committees. The guidelines below have been prepared to foster good practice and provide guidance to committee members in exercising their duties.

General guidelines

- **Accountability.** As a committee member, you are required to participate in committee activities in a lawful, ethical, and justifiable manner.
- **Confidentiality.** All committee-related information and documentation is strictly confidential unless otherwise declared. Confidentiality extends beyond the meeting. As a committee member, please do not speak on behalf of EMBO or the committee about the details or the outcome of selection processes, or comment personally on any decisions made. In particular, please do not divulge any such information to applicants, proposers, or other interested parties.
- **Impartiality and Conflicts of Interest (COI).** As a committee member, you must act in an impartial manner and declare any real, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest as soon as you become aware of them. Please refer to the EMBO COI policy, which is provided to you with the committee guidelines. The committee guidelines also give examples of COI that may occur specifically with respect to the work of your committee.
- **Data protection.** As a committee member, you will be privy to personal information about candidates and nominees. Please be aware of the sensitive character of the data you receive and ensure that you protect them appropriately. You must destroy any personal data provided to you for the purpose of a selection (application and nomination files, including references etc.) within six months after the conclusion of the respective selection procedure.
- **Decision making.** The EMBO Council has delegated decision-making authority to some committees to make decisions on applications or proposals. Any strategic decisions and substantial rule changes remain the prerogative only of the EMBO Council.

Preparation

- **Familiarise yourself with your committee's terms of reference.** Committee terms of reference are described in the committee guidelines. If you have any questions about these, please contact the committee chair or the responsible officer at EMBO.
- **Read the documentation and prepare for decisions** (agenda, minutes from previous meeting, applications etc.) prior to the meeting. Please reserve sufficient time e.g. to score candidates or nominees. If it is your first time on the committee this may take longer than you think. Please ask current or former committee members for advice if in doubt.

- **Submit documentation to the EMBO Office in time.** Any preparatory documentation (e.g. candidate scores) must reach EMBO in time for the office to assemble the necessary tables for discussion and decision at the committee meeting.

During the meeting

- **Attendance.** Committee members should ensure their presence at meetings and attend for the entire duration of the meeting. If it is absolutely necessary to leave early or arrive late, please advise the committee chair and the EMBO office, so that agenda items that need your particular input can be moved if possible.
- **No social media posts from the committee meeting.** Please do not divulge information from the meeting, even if it appears innocuous or non-confidential. It is fine to write that you will be attending or did attend, but not about what is being discussed; this is strictly confidential committee business. The EMBO administration may make recordings for the purpose of documentation (e.g. minutes), with the explicit consent of all attendees.
- **Concentrate on the task at hand.** Please do not engage in unrelated work or electronic communication during the meeting and turn off your mobile phone. Breaks during which you can make phone calls and check emails will be scheduled.
- **Be brief and to the point.**
- **Express your opinion.** You have been recruited to the committee for your expertise and competence. Your opinion is valued, and, in accordance with good scientific practice, should be reasoned.
- **Vote based on your expertise and conclusions.** You are recruited as an individual, not as a representative of a certain group. You may of course bring to the committee the interests or views that you perceive as being held by your community (based on gender, research field, nationality, etc.), but your decisions should be based on the conclusions you have drawn from the information you have been presented with. Please do not take advantage of your membership in the committee for the benefit of a particular group.
- **Consider other committee members' views but challenge the consensus if necessary.** If you feel that the consensus is based on incomplete or biased views or information, please voice your reservations. Keep in mind that the consensus reached should be in the best interest of the life science community.
- **Respect the selection guidelines and criteria.** Make decisions based on the criteria you are supposed to evaluate and adhere to the principles outlined in the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), chief among them making assessments based on scientific content rather than publication metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor (JIF). To learn more, visit the [DORA website](#).
- **Recognize (unconscious) biases.** We all have them and need to make a conscious effort to overcome them. As a committee member, please be aware that unconscious biases may affect decision-making (including your own) and please work to avoid them.

After the meeting

- **Feel free to suggest improvements** to the way the committee meeting is being run or conducted. Address either the chair or the officer or both if appropriate with your suggestions and comments. Your suggestions may become an agenda item if raised in time prior to the meeting.