HR Excellence in Research

GAP Analysis (Charter and Code Checklist)

GAP Analysis (Charter and Code Checklist)

Case number

2025CZ354620

Name Organisation under review

Institute of Plasma Physics of the CAS

Organisation’s contact details

U Slovanky 2525/1a, Prague, Česká republika, 18200, Czech Republic

Date endorsement charter and code

10/10/2025

GAP Analysis overview

The Charter and Code provides the basis for the Gap analysis. In order to aid cohesion, the GAP Analysis principles have been renumbered under the following headings. Please provide the outcome of your organisation's GAP analysis below. If your organisation currently does not fully meet the criteria, please list whether national or organisational legislation may be limiting the Charter's implementation, initiatives that have already been taken to improve the situation or new proposals that could remedy the current situation. In order to help the organisation's recruitment strategy, a specific self-assessment checklist is provided for Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment.

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers : GAP analysis overview

- **Status** : to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?
- **Implementation (++ , +/- , -/+, --)** :
  - ++ fully implemented
  - +/- almost but not fully implemented
  - -/+ partially implemented
  - -- insufficiently implemented
- **GAP** : In case of --, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation.
- **Implementation impediments** : If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation.
- **Initiatives undertaken/new proposals** : If relevant, please list any initiatives that have already been taken to improve the situation and/or new proposals that could remedy the current situation.

Status
PILLAR 1 – ETHICS, INTEGRITY, GENDER AND OPEN SCIENCE

Status		
1. ETHICS AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP operates within the Czech Academy of Sciences (CAS) ethical framework and has access to established reporting bodies. However, the updated 2024 CAS ethics and conduct standards have not yet been consolidated into a single bilingual IPP framework. Complaints are currently distributed among the CAS Research Integrity Committee, the CAS Ombudsperson, the institutional whistleblowing contact and internal arrangements; staff do not have one source explaining the scope of each route, contacts, response steps, confidentiality and protection from retaliation. Institute-wide expectations for supervisors and conflict-resolution pathways for doctoral candidates are also not formally documented. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, 33% of respondents stated that they would not feel confident reporting a serious problem; the corresponding shares were 47% among women, 45% among non-Czech speakers, and 44% among senior scientists. Among doctoral candidates, 12% did not know how to proceed in a conflict with a supervisor and 6% stated that they would not approach anyone. These results indicate uneven awareness of and confidence in the available routes rather than an absence of reporting mechanisms.	Action 1: IPP undertakes to harmonise its internal rules with the updated CAS ethical framework and publish one bilingual standard describing research-integrity, interpersonal-conduct and whistleblowing routes, contacts, response steps, confidentiality, non-retaliation rules and electronic reporting mechanisms. Action 16: IPP undertakes to publish supervision guidelines, an annual-feedback template for doctoral students and clear conflict-resolution contacts and will hold an annual best-practice meeting for supervisors. Action 6: IPP will include research-integrity reporting routes in the structured onboarding guide.

Status

2. FREEDOM OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
+/- almost but not fully i…	IPP researchers generally have a freedom to define research questions and publish results. The identified implementation gap concerns the framework supporting research security and continuity: information-security responsibilities, cybersecurity guidance, data-backup procedures and environment-hardening measures are not documented, communicated and implemented consistently across IPP. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, 45% of respondents considered information on data-backup tools insufficient; insufficient information was reported by 80% of postdoctoral respondents and 59% of respondents based in Turnov. The institutional gap is the consistent policy, training and technical support needed to safeguard research continuity and secure scientific cooperation.	Action 13: IPP undertakes to document and approve information-security and institutional-resilience policies, deliver cybersecurity and data-backup training, and deploy technical and environment-hardening measures.

Status

3. OPEN SCIENCE

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-/+ partially implemented	Open Science activities are present at IPP, but they are not yet supported by a comprehensive institutional framework. Current practice does not provide systematic support for Data Management Plans, Open Access and Open Data, a clearly designated Data Steward/Open Data contact, or common procedures for long-term research-data management. Open Science and data-management training is not yet integrated consistently into the institutional training offer. The gap analysis revealed the need for a governed repository for research-oriented materials, with defined rules for uploading, naming, access, updating and regular review. Survey awareness was uneven: 55% of respondents aged 35-44 and 46% of employees with more than ten years of service disagreed that the available Open Science information was sufficient. For data backup, only 47% of respondents considered the available information sufficient, with lower ratings among postdoctoral employees and staff in Turnov.	Action 2: IPP plans to establish an Open Science support framework covering Data Management Policy and Plan, Open Access and Open Data, appoint an Open Data Officer/Data Steward, integrate training and launch a governed shared repository for research-oriented materials. Action 13: IPP undertakes to complement the Open Science framework with security policies, backup training and technical safeguards.

Status

4. GENDER EQUALITY

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-/+ partially implemented	IPP has a Gender Equality Plan, an Equal Opportunities Working Group, flexible working arrangements and established occupational-safety processes. The remaining gap concerns consistent institute-wide guidance, communication, and monitoring. Equal-opportunity and anti-discrimination information is not yet consolidated bilingually, anti-harassment learning is not systematic, and managers and selection committees do not receive a common inclusive-leadership and selection training offer. Scientific staff corresponds to the male-dominated pool of university students in the relevant fields, and the internal review identified a need for more transparent recruitment of research division and department heads. Qualitative survey responses raised concerns about gender balance in decision-making and the visibility of routes for addressing inappropriate conduct. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, 22% of respondents considered the available benefits insufficient for coping with stress; this increased to 41% among research assistants and 31% among both women and non-Czech speakers. These findings suggest that more consistent equality communication and family-friendly working arrangements are needed.	Action 3: IPP will publish bilingual equal-opportunity and anti-discrimination guidance, launch anti-harassment and equal-opportunities e-learning, train managers and selection committees, and monitor workplace culture every two years. Action 5: IPP will introduce transparent OTM-R rules for recruiting research division and department heads. Action 11: IPP will update remote-work rules with family-friendly eligibility and approval arrangements for parents of young children and caregivers.

Status		
5. EMBRACING DIVERSITY		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP employs a diverse and international workforce, but access to institutional information and support is not yet equally consistent across language groups. Key internal documents, e-mails, policies and administrative guidance are not systematically available in Czech and English, and the internal policy framework is difficult to search. Onboarding varies between units and does not yet combine standard pre-arrival, first-day and first-month information with an English cultural and relocation guide. Among non-Czech speakers in the IPP Employee Survey 2026, the proportions reporting that they often or always need assistance were 37% for the intranet, 32% for purchasing procedures and 27% for internal communication. Qualitative responses also referred to tax, HR and pension-related issues. Equal-opportunity and inclusive-leadership information, together with access rules for shared institutional resources, could therefore be made more consistent and easier to navigate.	Action 4: IPP undertakes to adopt bilingual communication standards for key documents and e-mails and create a searchable Czech-English register of internal policies. Action 6: IPP will introduce structured pre-arrival, first-day and first-month onboarding and publish an English cultural and relocation guide. Action 2: IPP will establish clear access and maintenance rules for the shared research-materials repository.

Status

6. THE RESEARCHER

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
+/- almost but not fully i…	Researchers' professional responsibilities are established, but the division of administrative and operational work between researchers and support services is not always clear. In the survey, some researchers indicated that order specification, travel logistics, project administration, IT issues, and routine technical tasks alongside research causes increased workload. The activities most frequently proposed for transfer to support services were purchasing (26%), travel administration (26%), and IT support (23%). Open responses also identified uncertainty about the appropriate service contact and responsibility for resolving problems. Especially, department and division heads face an increased concentration of administrative and operational duties. Furthermore, delegable management tasks, triggers and rules for temporary substitution by deputy department and division heads are not defined. The gap therefore concerns unresolved interfaces and ownership of administrative and support tasks rather than an absence of support services.	Action 12: IPP will clarify the scope of administrative and support services, promote protected time for uninterrupted work, provide training in time management and effective delegation, and facilitate hybrid participation of deputies in relevant management meetings.

Status

7. FREE CIRCULATION OF RESEARCHERS

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
+/- almost but not fully i…	IPP researchers participate in international projects and mobility, and specialist capacity for funding and mobility support is available. Information on opportunities is nevertheless distributed across several channels rather than maintained as a single resource with a named owner and update mechanism. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, respondents under 35 reported insufficient awareness of grant opportunities (44%) and mobility opportunities (50%). The identified gap is therefore the visibility, coordination and regular maintenance of information on internal and external calls, eligibility, deadlines, contacts and relevant CAS/EURAXESS opportunities, particularly for early-career researchers.	Action 14: IPP will launch a centrally maintained Funding and Mobility Information Hub covering calls, eligibility criteria, deadlines and CAS/EURAXESS links, designate a responsible contact and review annual usage.

Status		
8. SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP already applies environmental and resource-management practices, but staff do not yet have concise institution-wide guidance aligned with the MSCA Green Charter or a practical checklist covering digital workflows, energy-saving habits and sustainable commuting. Research sustainability can be extrapolated to sustainability of human resources in research. The survey also identified: 31% of respondents reported difficulty managing the long-term pace of work, rising to 44% among women, 42% among associate scientists and 40% among respondents aged 35-44. Open responses linked this mainly to overbooking, fragmented work, and limited time for focused work and self-development. Project deadlines and infrastructure operations contribute to workload peaks. Existing remote-work rules provide a basis for flexibility, while eligibility and approval arrangements for family-friendly use could be communicated and applied more consistently.	Action 9: IPP will publish institutional guidance aligned with the MSCA Green Charter and a practical Green Research Checklist covering digital workflows, energy-saving habits and sustainable commuting. Action 11: IPP plans to update and communicate remote-work rules with defined family-friendly eligibility and approval procedures, in order to improve the sustainability of human resources in research
PILLAR 2 – RESEARCHERS ASSESSMENT, RECRUITMENT AND PROGRESSION		

Status		

9. RESEARCHERS' ASSESSMENT

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-/+ partially implemented	IPP has recently revised its mandatory researcher-evaluation rules. The survey indicates that the main remaining gap is understanding and consistent developmental follow-up rather than the absence of a formal process. Only 18% of respondents reported a clear understanding of expectations for their current or future qualification grade, while 28% rated their understanding at lower levels of the survey scale. Qualitative responses requested clearer information on evaluation criteria and greater recognition of team, technical, infrastructure, and leadership contributions. Development-oriented feedback already takes place in some departments, but IPP does not yet have a common methodology, documentation template or mechanism for following aggregate development needs outside mandatory evaluation. Communication of variable salary components is also uneven: 43% of respondents did not understand how their salary is determined or how they can influence variable remuneration.	Action 7: IPP undertakes to publish guidance and embedded form instructions for mandatory researcher evaluation, hold annual information sessions and verify employee understanding through regular surveys. Action 8: IPP will introduce a common methodology and templates for voluntary annual feedback discussions and monitor participation and aggregate development needs. Action 10: IPP undertakes to publish guidance on variable salary components, provide managers with recommendations for explaining bonus decisions and monitor employee understanding.

Status		
10. RECRUITMENT		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-- insufficiently impleme…	IPP already uses competitive recruitment and advertises internationally through institutional networks and channels such as LinkedIn and ResearchGate. These practices are, however, not yet codified in an institution-wide Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment (OTM-R) policy. Vacancy notices, HR involvement, selection methods, interview principles, recruitment records, candidate communication, and compliance checks are not standardized across all researcher recruitments. A dedicated transparent framework for recruiting research division and department heads is also not in place. Onboarding after recruitment varies between units and does not yet follow a common methodology covering pre-arrival, first-day, first-month, administrative, safety and role-specific induction. Written institutional principles for doctoral admission and thesis-defense committees are not yet consolidated.	Action 5: IPP plans to adopt and publish an OTM-R policy covering vacancy advertising, HR involvement, selection, interviews, documentation and candidate communication, supported by standard templates, committee briefings and a compliance checklist. Action 6: IPP will implement a structured onboarding methodology and standard pre-arrival, first-day and first-month checklists. Action 17: IPP will document, approve and publish common principles for doctoral admission and thesis-defense committees.

Status

11. SELECTION

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-- insufficiently impleme…	Current selection practice includes competitive procedures, inclusive wording in vacancy notices and attention to committee gender balance. The gap identified by the internal review is the inconsistency of recruitment procedures across departments and the absence of documentation or records regarding the application of OTM-R rules. IPP does not yet have common rules for committee appointment and composition, structured assessment and interviews, selection records, candidate communication, or an OTM-R compliance check for every completed recruitment. Committee members are not systematically briefed on impartiality, conflicts of interest, equal opportunities, and unconscious bias. Candidate notification and feedback depend on the unit or person leading the recruitment. Rules for the selection of research division and department heads are not sufficiently standardized or transparent. These findings arise from the process review and OTM-R self-assessment; the employee survey did not directly evaluate individual recruitment procedures.	Action 3: IPP will provide equality, anti-harassment and inclusive-selection training for managers and selection committees. Action 5: IPP will standardize selection through OTM-R templates, mandatory impartiality briefings and a compliance checklist and will establish transparent rules for selecting research division and department heads.

Status		
12. CAREER PROGRESSION		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP has formal qualification grades and performs mandatory researcher evaluations in defined intervals, but the relationship between evaluation criteria, grade expectations and career progression is not sufficiently clear to all employee groups. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, only 18% of respondents reported a clear understanding of expectations for their current or future qualification grade, while 28% reported low understanding. Postdoctoral respondents also reported limited institutional development support, with 32% disagreeing that the support available to them was sufficient. Career guidance and development feedback depend largely on individual supervisors and departmental practice. IPP does not have a common voluntary annual-discussion framework, an institution-wide scientific mentoring framework, or common written principles for doctoral committees to review research topics, supervisor pairings and academic expectations from the outset.	Action 5: IPP will make recruitment and progression more transparent through the institutional OTM-R policy. Action 7: IPP undertakes to clarify evaluation criteria, required documentation and qualification expectations through guidance, form instructions and annual information sessions. Action 8: IPP will introduce voluntary development-oriented discussions separate from the mandatory evaluation process. Action 15: IPP will consult potential mentors and mentees and prepare a stakeholder-reviewed mentoring framework and recommendations for a future pilot. Action 17: IPP plans to formalize doctoral-committee rules covering research topics, supervisor pairings and academic expectations.
PILLAR 3 - WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES		

Status		
13. WORKING CONDITIONS, FUNDING AND SALARIES		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP provides flexible working time, part-time arrangements, home-office options, extended employee benefits, and occupational health and safety support. The survey and internal review identified uneven understanding and access rather than a general absence of provisions. Forty-three per cent of respondents did not understand how their salary is determined or how they can influence variable remuneration. Twenty-two per cent considered the available benefits insufficient for coping with stress, increasing to 41% among research assistants and 31% among women and non-Czech speakers. International staff reported language barriers in administrative processes. There is a lack of clarity of the remote-work eligibility and approval arrangements. Reporting and conflict-resolution information is fragmented. Researchers and research leaders described unclear boundaries with support services and concentrated administrative workloads. Managers lack deeper knowledge and skills of delegation options and their effective application. IPP does not offer sabbaticals, as these are typically guaranteed by law only at universities, and has not assessed whether they could serve as a feasible tool to improve researchers' well-being at work.	Action 1: IPP undertakes to publish bilingual and confidential reporting routes for research integrity, interpersonal conduct and whistleblowing. Action 3: IPP will publish equality and anti-discrimination guidance and provide anti-harassment and inclusive-leadership learning. Action 4: IPP undertakes to set bilingual communication standards and create a searchable bilingual policy register. Action 6: IPP will implement structured onboarding for all new employees. Action 10: IPP undertakes to improve communication of variable salary components and bonus decisions. Action 11: IPP plans to introduce family-friendly remote-work rules for parents of young children and caregivers. Action 12: IPP will clarify the scope of administrative and support services, promote protected time for uninterrupted work, provide training in time management and effective delegation, and facilitate hybrid participation of deputies in relevant management meetings. Action 16: IPP undertakes to publish supervision guidance and conflict-resolution pathways. Action 18: IPP will assess the legal, financial and operational feasibility of a sabbatical-like research leave and prepare draft rules for management's decision.

Status

14. STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-/+ partially implemented	Job stability at IPP is high. IPP seeks to support career continuity, but in some cases, fixed-term grant funding and public-research funding rules limit the institution's ability to provide long-term contractual certainty. Permanent positions are supplemented by temporary ones based on project needs or external funding to ensure competitive wage levels. Survey findings on career support provide relevant context: 32% of postdoctoral respondents disagreed that they receive sufficient institutional support, and early-career respondents reported limited clarity regarding progression and future opportunities. Repeated fixed-term appointments can therefore cause a sense of job insecurity, while the principal implementation impediment remains external project-based funding. The gap within IPP's control is transparent communication about contract decisions, career planning and available development routes rather than the funding model itself.	No standalone action is assigned to Principle 14 because there is a high job stability at IPP, and the principal impediment is external project-based funding. IPP plans to continue monitoring transparency of contract decisions and career planning through its employment and feedback processes.

Status		
15. CONTRACTUAL AND LEGAL OBLIGATIONS		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP has an established internal regulatory framework, but employees do not always find the relevant requirements easy to locate and interpret. Guidance on Open Science, Data Management Plans, Open Access and Open Data is not yet consolidated, and contractual, legal, administrative and research-integrity information is not presented consistently through onboarding. Information security, cybersecurity, and backup responsibilities could be more systematically documented and supported by targeted training to ensure alignment with the relevant requirements arising from the NIS2 Directive and its national implementation. Survey evidence shows uneven awareness of research-safety obligations: only 46% of respondents considered information on cooperation with sanctioned countries or entities sufficient; insufficient awareness was reported by 61% of respondents in managerial roles and 47% of employees with more than ten years of service. The gap is therefore accessibility and consistent implementation of existing and developing obligations, not the absence of a regulatory framework.	Action 2: IPP will provide Open Science, Data Management Plan, Open Access and Open Data guidance and integrate related training into the institutional offer. Action 6: IPP will consolidate contractual, legal, administrative and research-integrity guidance within structured onboarding. Action 13: IPP undertakes to approve security and resilience policies, deliver cybersecurity and backup training, and deploy planned technical safeguards.

Status		
16. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
+/- almost but not fully i…	IPP has issued internal commercialisation rules and has strengthened public communication and knowledge-transfer capacity through specialist roles. The remaining gap concerns consistent access to supporting information and reusable research outputs. Open Science and data-management procedures are still being developed, and there is a lack of shared repository for research-oriented materials such as conference posters, presentations, recordings, and guidance. Survey evidence indicates uneven awareness of rights connected with exploitation: 70% of postdoctoral respondents reported insufficient information on intellectual-property rules and joint ownership of research data. Clear repository governance and more accessible guidance would support both internal reuse and responsible wider dissemination.	Action 2: IPP will launch and initially populate a governed repository for research-oriented materials, including conference posters and presentations, with clear rules for uploading, access, maintenance and regular review.
PILLAR 4 -RESEARCH CAREERS AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT		

Status

17. VALUING DIVERSE RESEARCH CAREERS

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
-/+ partially implemented	IPP's revised formal evaluation rules provide a basis for recognising research performance. Qualitative survey responses nevertheless described a perceived emphasis on individual publications and grant success, with less visible recognition of team science, technical and infrastructure work, coordination, project leadership, supervision, mentoring, knowledge valorisation and science communication. The survey also showed limited understanding of qualification expectations, with only 18% reporting clear understanding. The gap is therefore the clarity with which diverse contributions and career paths are communicated within assessment and reward processes. Communication of variable remuneration is also uneven. IPP does not offer sabbaticals, as these are typically guaranteed by law only at universities, and has not assessed whether they could serve as a feasible tool for career development, retention and burnout prevention.	Action 7: IPP undertakes to improve understanding of formal assessment criteria and qualification expectations. Action 10: IPP undertakes to strengthen and monitor communication about variable salary components and bonus decisions. Action 18: IPP will assess and design a sabbatical-like research-focus leave framework to support career development, retention and burnout prevention, subject to legal, financial and operational feasibility.

Status		
18. CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND ADVICE		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	IPP offers scientific collaboration, mobility, seminars, and access to CAS and institutional development opportunities. Career support nevertheless depends strongly on individual supervisors and varies between departments. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, respondents under 35 reported insufficient awareness of grant opportunities (44%) and mobility opportunities (50%); 32% of postdoctoral respondents disagreed that they receive sufficient institutional support. IPP does not have a common annual development-discussion framework, a centrally maintained funding and mobility hub, or an institution-wide scientific mentoring framework. Written doctoral-committee principles do not consistently clarify research topics, supervisor pairings, and academic expectations at the beginning of doctoral study. IPP does not offer sabbaticals, as these are typically guaranteed by law only at universities, and has not assessed them for legal, financial and operational feasibility.	Action 8: IPP will introduce voluntary annual feedback discussions to support development planning and monitor aggregate development needs. Action 14: IPP will centralize funding and mobility opportunities, deadlines and contacts in a maintained intranet hub. Action 15: IPP will prepare a consulted framework and recommendations for a future voluntary scientific mentoring pilot. Action 17: IPP will formalize doctoral-committee rules on research topics, supervisor pairings and academic expectations. Action 18: IPP will analyze and draft operating rules for a sabbatical-like research leave for management’s decision.

Status

19. CONTINUOUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken/new proposals
+/- almost but not fully i…	IPP and CAS provide professional-development opportunities, seminars and project-supported training, but the offer is not coordinated as one institutional framework and awareness varies between employee groups. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, 32% of respondents considered the training offer insufficient, including 44% of respondents aged 35-44, 43% of women, 43% of respondents in managerial roles and 42% of postdoctoral respondents. Requested topics included leadership and team management (47%) and project management and time efficiency (58%), alongside communication, mentoring, grant writing and career development. Open Science and research-data-management training is not integrated systematically into the institutional offer.	Action 2: IPP will integrate Open Science and data-management training into the institutional offer and launch a governed shared repository for research-oriented training materials and outputs to support continuous professional development of researchers.

Status		
20. SUPERVISION AND MENTORING		
Implementation	**GAP / Implementation impediments**	**Initiatives undertaken/new proposals**
-/+ partially implemented	Supervision and mentoring are provided through departmental and individual practice, but common institutional standards and support tools are not in place. In the IPP Employee Survey 2026, 30% of supervisors reported insufficient resources and institutional support, while 32% of postdoctoral respondents reported insufficient support. Among doctoral candidates, 12% did not know how to proceed in a conflict with a supervisor and 6% stated that they would not approach anyone. IPP does not have common supervision guidelines covering expectations, annual meetings, progress review, feedback, and conflict-resolution contacts. A voluntary scientific mentoring programme is at a preparatory stage and requires an assessment of needs, roles, matching principles, and organisational arrangements. Common doctoral admission and thesis-defense committee principles are not yet documented. Research leaders also lack a complete framework for delegation and temporary substitution, which could reduce time available for supervision.	Action 12: IPP will clarify the scope of administrative and support services, provide training in time management and effective delegation, and facilitate hybrid participation of deputies in relevant management meetings so research leaders can sustain supervision and mentoring responsibilities. Action 15: IPP will identify mentoring needs and prepare a stakeholder-reviewed framework and recommendations for a future voluntary scientific mentoring pilot. Action 16: IPP undertakes to publish supervision guidelines, an annual-feedback template for doctoral students and conflict-resolution pathways and will hold an annual best-practice meeting for supervisors. Action 17: IPP plans to document and publish common principles for doctoral admission and thesis-defense committees.