

Scheda di Valutazione

Codice	2009NXTCP9
Coordinatore	SALVADORI Neri
Ateneo	Università di PISA
Titolo	Cambiamento strutturale e crescita

Criterio	Voto	Giudizio Collegiale
a) Rilevanza, originalità e possibile impatto della ricerca proposta e della sua metodologia, nonché potenzialità di realizzazione di un significativo avanzamento delle conoscenze rispetto allo stato dell'arte: fino a punti 30	29/30	The main research aims are relevant, interesting and some of them are novel. Despite sectoral structural change (SC) has been the object of a large body of theoretical and empirical literature and therefore less of a novel contribution – spatial and institutional SC are less explored. In principle the proposed research might therefore provide a relevant and original contribution. However, the proposal as currently formulated presents a number of weaknesses and the way the implementation of the research is provided is not entirely convincing. The research aims are quite fragmented and a unifying framework is missing. There is quite some heterogeneity among the contributions of the different units (different parts of the project). Although aims and results are stretched into the same keywords, it is difficult to see the relation between the areas/partners. There is a relation between these areas (and in some of the authors past research) when one stretches research areas very broadly, but the common aim of the different units is not easily defined. Further, the empirical contribution of the proposal is mentioned though not detailed - nor are the data base to be employed. This said, the general aim of the project is very relevant, and the single aims are likely to have a strong impact within their respective research area.
b.1) Possibilità di conseguire nei tempi previsti i risultati attesi: fino a punti 4	3/4	The principal investigators of each research units show a solid research experience in the area identified in the project. Both the principal investigators and (in most cases) the rest of the personnel are likely to be currently working on the background of some of the proposed outcomes (as shown from non published work). The great majority of output is either theoretical or (possibly) uses available secondary data and does not require field work or the search for secondary data. However, the scheduled timing and implementation plan proposed in Section 12 fail to provide solid evidence on how the proposed project is to be implemented - besides the list of working paper to be produced - nor it produces any timetable.
b.2) Coerenza tra le richieste economiche e la ricerca proposta: fino a punti 6	6/6	Provided the limited number of hired personnel (no Phd, PostDoc, or research positions will be open), and the absence of direct research costs, the main expenses are for workshop organisation and travels. In particular, it is not clear how the units justify the amount of hardware and software requested. The referees are not aware of the Italian system of funds allocation so they choose to leave the final assessment of the budget coherence to the Committee.

<p>c) Qualificazione scientifica, anche in relazione al progetto presentato, del coordinatore scientifico, dei responsabili di unità e delle unità operative nel loro complesso, con riferimento alla valutazione della loro attività scientifica negli ultimi cinque anni secondo criteri di valutazione scientifica internazionali, ed alla competenza nel settore oggetto della proposta: fino a punti 20</p>	<p>20/20</p>	<p>The scientific level of the coordinator and the other people involved in the project is quite high. Almost all investigators have published extensively in internationally recognized journals, and a couple of them are internationally renowned scholars in their area of expertise.</p>
--	--------------	---

Voto Complessivo 58

Commento generale Overall the research proposal is very relevant and some of the main research aims are novel and original. The scientific expertise of the coordinator and each of the components of the team are of high standards and all have an international profile. The proposal is well crafted though it lacks a solid unifying framework. The implementation of the project and timetable are not well developed.

Valutazione d'eccellenza (Da compilare solo per voto complessivo >= 58) The referees value the top-ranked scientific expertise of the coordinator and the single teams. They acknowledge the relevance of the research proposed and the aspects of originality in some of the main research aims proposed. They highly value each of the research proposal of the units. They overall rank the proposal with 58/60 due to the lack of a unifying framework linking the single units proposals.