



Università
Ca' Foscari
Venezia

REGULATION GOVERNING PUBLIC SELECTIONS FOR THE
RECRUITMENT OF FIXED-TERM RESEARCHERS
PURSUANT TO ART. 24 OF LAW 240/10

ART. 1 - Scope of application

1. This Regulation governs, pursuant to Art. 24 of Law 240/2010, the recruitment, through comparative evaluation procedure, of staff responsible for research, teaching, supplementary teaching and student service activities at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, hereinafter referred to as the "University", through a private law fixed-term employment contract, hereinafter referred to as "fixed-term researchers".

ART. 2 - Nature of the relationship

1. The employment relationship between the University and the fixed-term researcher shall be regulated by a private-law employment contract concluded in compliance with the current provisions on the matter, also as regards tax, welfare and social security arrangements.
2. The conclusion of the contracts referred to in paragraph 1 of this article shall be intended to enable research, teaching, supplementary teaching and student service activities.
3. The procedures for carrying out the activities referred to in paragraph 2 of this article shall be established by the contract and in the university regulations.

ART. 3 - Types of contracts

1. Contracts may be:
 - a. three-year contracts which may be extended only for two years, one time only, upon positive evaluation of the teaching and research activities carried out, performed in accordance with the provisions of Art. 9 of this regulation and in compliance with Ministerial Decree No. 242/2011; the aforementioned contracts may be concluded with the same person even in different locations;
 - b. non-renewable three-year contracts, reserved for candidates who have benefited from the contracts referred to in subpara. a), or of research fellowships pursuant to Article 51, paragraph 6, of Law No.449 of 27 December 1997, and subsequent amendments, or post-PhD scholarships pursuant to Article 4 of Law No. 398 of 30/11/1989, or similar contracts, grants or scholarships in foreign universities for at least three years, even if not consecutive. These contracts may also be concluded with candidates who have benefited from contracts pursuant to Article 1, paragraph 14 of Law 230/2005 for at least 3 years.
2. The contracts referred to in paragraph 1 subpara. a) may provide for a full-time or a part-time recruitment. The contracts referred to in paragraph 1, subpara. b), shall be exclusively concluded on a full-time basis. The overall annual commitment for teaching, supplementary teaching and student service activities is 350 hours for full-time contracts and 200 hours for part-time contracts.

ART. 4 – Programming

1. The Department Board, in line with the needs relating to research, teaching, supplementary teaching and student services, shall resolve on requests for the activation of fixed-term researcher contracts, which can also be made by the Interdepartmental Schools.
2. As part of the three-year programming, each Department shall bind resources corresponding to at least 50% of the positions allocated to the calls for contracts referred to in Article 3, paragraph 1 subpara. b), to the appointment of scholars having the experience requirements listed in paragraph 3 of Article 6.
3. The resolution of the Department Board shall report:
 - the academic recruitment field;
 - the academic discipline(s);

- the research programme and its duration; the programme may be proposed by one or more professors, including those belonging to different departments;
 - the teaching activities, including supplementary ones, and of service to the students provided, with specific reference to the programming and the teaching products to which they refer;
 - the type of contract to be signed, pursuant to Article 3 of this regulation;
 - the type of recruitment (full-time or part-time, where applicable to the type of contract);
 - the foreign language required;
 - the language spoken during the discussion of qualifications and publications;
 - the requirements of the fixed-term researcher, in addition to those indicated in Article 6 of this regulation;
 - the criteria for candidate selection where equal judgements from the committee arise, in line with the needs of the Department (three-year development plan and/or research programme, and/or teaching needs);
 - financial coverage with an indication of the source of the funding, where external to the University.
4. The Academic Senate, through the potential support of preliminary committee, shall evaluate the proposals received from the Departments and verify the consistency of the requests submitted with the teaching needs of the university, thus expressing its opinion and submitting it to the Board of Governors.
5. The Board of Governors, based on the opinion of the Academic Senate and in compliance with the available resources, shall decide which fixed-term research positions are to be activated and the start of the selection procedures.

ART. 5 - Call

1. The call for the evaluation procedure shall be published by the Rector of the University upon request of the proposing Department and shall be published in the Official Journal (Gazzetta Ufficiale) of the Republic of Italy, placed on the University website and sent to MIUR and the European Union for the publication on their respective sites. The call shall be written in Italian and in English.

The call shall include:

- the academic recruitment field;
 - the academic discipline(s);
 - specific functions, in terms of research, teaching, supplementary teaching and student service activities required;
 - the type of contract and the type of recruitment (full-time or part-time, where applicable to the type of contract)
 - salary and social security arrangements;
 - the participation requirements;
 - any foreign language for which the oral exam is provided pursuant to Art. 24 paragraph 2, subpara. c) of Law 240/2010;
 - the language spoken during the discussion of qualifications and publications;
 - the maximum number, not less than twelve, of the publications that each candidate may submit, in addition to the PhD thesis that will still be evaluated;
 - the criteria for evaluating qualifications and publications, with reference to the provisions of Ministerial Decree No. 243 and consistently with any indications provided by the Board of Governors when assigning positions, after consulting the Academic Senate, in relation to the objectives defined by the University strategic plan;
 - the criteria for candidate selection where equal judgements from the committee arise, in line with the needs of the Department (three-year development plan and/or research programme, and/or teaching needs);
2. The deadline for submitting applications starts from the date of publication on the University website and may not be less than 30 days.
3. Applications, qualifications and publications shall be submitted through the channels, including IT, ones provided for in the call.

ART. 6 - Requirements for participation in the selection procedure and incompatibility

1. Italian or foreign candidates holding a PhD or equivalent qualification, obtained in Italy or abroad, shall be admitted to participate in the evaluation procedure.
2. Only for selections concerning contracts referred to in Article 3, paragraph 1, subpara. b) of these Regulation, participation shall be reserved to candidates holding a PhD qualification, who have benefited for at least three years, even if not consecutive:
 - a. from contracts referred to in Art. 3, paragraph 1, subpara. a), of this Regulation; or
 - b. from contracts referred to in Article 1, paragraph 14, of Law No. 230/2005; or
 - c. from research fellowships pursuant to Art. 51, paragraph 6, of Law No. 449/1997, and subsequent amendments, or post-PhD scholarships pursuant to Art. 4 of Law No. 398/1989, or similar contracts, fellowships or grants in foreign universities, or international fellowships or grants; or
 - d. from research fellowships pursuant to Art. 22 of Law No. 240/2010,

or candidates who have obtained the national scientific qualification of full or associate professor referred to in Article 16 of Law No. 240/2010.

To accrue the minimum three-year period referred to in this paragraph, the services provided in types a), b), c) and d) may be cumulated.

3. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Art. 4, the call may also provide, as a requirement, that candidates shall have at least one of the following requirements:
 - have obtained a PhD or a research fellowship or covered the role of researcher referred to in subpara. a) at an institution other than that in which they obtained the Master's degree or equivalent qualification or, as an alternative, have obtained the same qualifications at foreign institutions, or in the case of a joint degree with foreign universities; or
 - have carried out at least one year (on a continuous basis, even if spread over several periods) of duly documented PhD or equivalent research activity at universities and/or research centres abroad.
4. The requirements described shall exist on the expiry date of the deadline for submitting the application for admission to the selection. The exclusion from the selection shall be justified by a Rector's provision notified to the candidate concerned. Furthermore, candidates holding existing or past contracts as research fellows and fixed-term researcher in compliance with Articles 22 and 24 of Law 240/2010 at Ca' Foscari or other Italian, state or non-state universities, online universities, as well as the institutions referred to in paragraph 1 of Art. 22 of Law 240/2010 for a period which, in combination with the duration provided for by the contract of the call, exceeds a total of 12 years, even if not continuous. Periods spent on maternity leave or on sick leave according to current legislation shall not be considered for the definition of the duration of the above relationships. Persons already hired under a permanent contract as university full or associate professors or as researchers, although they have been retired, may not participate in the selection procedures.
5. Candidates who, upon submitting the application, have a degree of kinship or affinity, up to and including the fourth degree, with a professor belonging to the Department requesting the professorship or to the Unit involved, or with the Rector, the General Director or a member of the University Board of Governors, may not participate in the selection procedures.

ART. 7 - Selection Committee

1. Candidates shall be evaluated by a specific Committee, proposed by resolution of the Department Board and appointed by Rector's Decree.
2. The Committee shall be made up of at least three members, chosen from full university professors, the majority of which chosen from outside the university, including from foreign universities.

3. The members shall have an experience of continuous international research in the previous 5 years and, where applicable, shall comply with the requirements set out in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Article 6 of Law 240/2010 and current legislation. For the appointment of the Selection Committee, the rules on incompatibility and conflict of interest and those provided for in the Code of Ethics shall apply. Specifically, the members of the Committee may not have been supervisors/tutors of the candidates' PhD theses. In particular, any relationships between members and candidates shall be communicated in the declarations on the absence of a conflict of interest made by the commissioners.
4. Commissioners may remain in office only for two procedures during each calendar year, considering both the procedures relating to researcher positions and those relating to professorships, possibly extendable to a maximum of three procedures for academic recruitment fields with a small number of affiliate professors.
5. In carrying out its activities, the Committee shall comply with the following provisions:
 - preliminary evaluation of candidates, with justified analytical judgment of their qualifications, curriculum and scientific production, including PhD thesis, according to internationally recognised criteria and parameters identified with Ministerial Decree No. 243 of 25 May 2011 and in line with any indications expressed by the Board of Governors when assigning positions, after consulting the Academic Senate, in relation to the objectives set by the University strategic plan, to be performed in compliance with the guidelines for the evaluation referred to in annex 1 to these Regulation;
 - admission of 10-20% of the total candidates among those evaluated on a comparative basis, following the preliminary evaluation, and, in any case, not less than six, to the public interview with the committee to discuss the qualifications and scientific production; the candidates shall all be admitted to the discussion if their number is equal to or less than six; assignment of a score to the qualifications and to each of the publications submitted by the candidates admitted to the interview;
 - discussion by the candidates of the qualifications and scientific production in the language provided for in the call, in public or online session ensuring the principle of public access to the interview;
 - collective judgment for the candidates admitted to the discussion of qualifications and publications, with indication of any eligible candidates and reparation of summary judgment for each one;
 - placement of eligible candidates according to a scale of merit on a comparative basis.
6. For the evaluation of candidates, written and oral exams shall be excluded, with the exception of the oral exam aimed at assessing adequate proficiency in the foreign language provided for in the call, which shall be held at the same time as the discussion of qualifications and publications. To assess proficiency in the foreign language, the committee may be supported by one or more experts. The date of the interview will be announced, according to the procedures provided for in the call, at least 15 days in advance.
7. At all stages of the procedure, the Committee may resort to of IT tools for collegial work.
8. The acts of the Committee shall consist of the minutes of the meetings, with related decisions attached, and shall be sent within 7 days from the conclusion of the work by the Chairman of the committee to the Human Resources Area of the Teaching Staff Office for verification and approval within thirty days by Rector's Decree.
9. Once approved, the documents shall be sent to the Director of the Department responsible for the appointment proposal.
10. The Committee shall conclude its work within three months from the date of the appointment, unless otherwise provided. The deadline may be extended for proven and exceptional reasons notified by the Chairman of the Committee. Should the works not be completed by the set deadline, the Rector, by a justified provision, shall start the procedures for replacing the members deemed responsible for the delay, while setting a new deadline for the conclusion of the works.

11. In evaluating the applications and drafting the minutes, the Committee shall comply with the guidelines, as indicated in paragraph 4 above, and with the formats provided by the University.

ART. 8 - Appointment

1. Within 60 days from the receipt of the approved documents, the Department Board shall resolve on the proposal to appoint the best candidate evaluated on a comparative basis, as resulting from the judgments expressed by the evaluation committee. In the case of candidates having the same score, the resolution shall contain justification of the reasons for the choice of the candidate, in compliance with the criteria set out in the announcement.
2. The resolution referred to in paragraph 1 shall be adopted, with justified reason, on the basis of the results of the evaluation of the Committee and in relation to the criteria defined in the call in the event of parity between the best candidates, upon verification of non-incompatibility referred to in Article 18, paragraph 1, subpara. b of Law 240/2010 and the incompatibilities provided for by current legislation.
3. The resolution referred to in paragraph 1 shall be adopted with the favourable vote of the absolute majority of full and associate professors, and shall be transmitted, together with the acts of the committee, to the Board of Governors for the approval of the appointment and to the Human Resources Area of the Teaching Staff Office.
4. If, despite the presence of candidates judged as eligible by the Committee, the Department may not propose the appointment, the Department Director shall send a report containing the reasons to the Academic Senate, together with the acts of the committee. After evaluating the documents and the report, the Academic Senate may propose sanctions against the Department to the Board of Governors.
5. In the event of withdrawal, non-acceptance or resignation of the best candidate evaluated on a comparative basis referred to in paragraph 1, within six months from the assignment of the position, the Department may submit to the Board of Governors the proposal to appoint another candidate deemed eligible by the committee in compliance with the ranking order. In any case, this appointment shall become effective no later than the maximum term of one year from the date of approval of the acts and without prejudice to compliance with the legal constraints on hiring and compatibility with the financial resources covering the contract.

ART. 9 - Evaluation of researchers holding the contracts referred to in Art. 3 paragraph 1 subpara. a)

1. The researcher holding a contract pursuant to Art. 3 paragraph 1 subpara. a) shall be subjected to evaluation of the teaching and research activity, also for the purposes of the two-year extension, in the six months preceding the expiry of the existing contract.
2. The evaluation of the teaching and research activity carried out under the contract referred to in paragraph 1, shall be performed on the basis of the methods, criteria and parameters provided for in the following paragraphs in compliance with the provisions of Ministerial Decree No. 242/2011.
3. The evaluation shall be performed by a Committee, appointed by the Rector and made up of 3 members, also from foreign universities, chosen from a shortlist of names proposed by the Department to which the researcher subjected to evaluation belongs.
4. The Commissioners shall be university professors and have the additional subjective requirements indicated in Art. 7 paragraph 3 of this regulation.
5. The Committee shall identify among its members the Chairman and the Secretary drafting the minutes, if not identified in the appointment decree.
6. The Committee shall deliver its opinion on the adequacy of the research and teaching activity carried out in relation to the provisions set forth in the contract with the researcher and in the research project attached to it. To this end, the Department shall draft a specific report detailing the results obtained by the researcher within the project and the additional qualitative/quantitative elements contained in Annex 2 to these Regulation.

7. The Committee shall complete its work within 1 month from the appointment, unless otherwise specified in the Rector's appointment provision. The deadline may be extended for proven and exceptional reasons indicated by the Chairman of the Committee. Should the works not be completed by the set deadline, the Rector, by a justified provision, shall start the procedures for replacing the members deemed responsible for the delay, while setting a new deadline for the conclusion of the works.
8. In the event of a positive evaluation, the Department may propose to the Board of Governors, with the consent of the interested party, the extension of the contract, which shall be duly justified by educational and/or research needs.
9. The Board of Governors, within the limits of the resources available for staff planning, shall resolve on the extension proposal within the term of the contract.
10. In the event of negative evaluation procedure, the contract shall not be extended.

ART. 10 - Evaluation of researchers holding the contracts referred to in Art. 3 paragraph 1 subpara. b)

1. The evaluation of researchers holding the contracts referred to in Art. 3 paragraph 1 subpara. b), for the purposes of classifying the roles of associate professor pursuant to Art. 24 paragraph 5 of Law 240/2010 shall be governed by the University Regulation governing selection and appointment procedures for full professors and associate professors, to which reference is made.

ART. 11 - Conclusion of the contract

1. The Administration, upon conclusion of the individual fixed-term employment contract, shall invite the interested party to submit within 30 days the documentation required by the provisions in force and that provided for by the call. For the University, the contract shall be concluded by the Rector or their delegate.
2. start of the service shall be proposed by the Department, in relation to research and teaching needs, within the limits of the financial resources available and any legal constraints.

ART. 12 - Final provisions

For anything not provided for in this Regulation and insofar as they are compatible, the legal provisions on the matter shall apply.

Annex 1 - Guidelines for the evaluation of candidates by the Committees

The procedure involving the selection committee may be summarised in the following stages:

1. Preliminary meeting: definition of criteria (see Ministerial Decree 243/2011) and possible request for an external expert for the evaluation (oral exam) of adequate proficiency in a foreign language (see call);
2. Preliminary evaluation of candidates, with justified analytical judgment on qualifications, curriculum and scientific production (for the criteria see Ministerial Decree 243/2011) (using the Annex A form); admission to the public discussion of the qualifications and scientific production of 6 candidates or, in the presence of more than 60 candidates, a percentage between 10% and 20%
Stage 1 and 2 may be held on the same day.
3. Discussion of qualifications and publications and oral exam of a foreign language proficiency (insufficient/sufficient/fair/good/excellent knowledge); assignment of a score to the qualifications and to each of the publications; overall opinion on each single candidate to be assessed as eligible/ not eligible for appointment (using the Annex B form);
Note: all sessions may be held with the support of IT tools for collective work upon indication of the following requirements in the minutes:
 - o indication of the place;
 - o type of IT tools (skype, videoconference);
 - o for the interview of candidates: identification of the candidate through identification document and presence of an official certifying the identity of the candidate (e.g., official/professor of the university research centre);
 - o public session.

Preliminary evaluation (stage 2):

Justified analytical judgment on qualifications, curriculum and scientific production

Reference legislation:

- Art. 24, paragraph 2, subpara. c) of Law 240/2010
- Ministerial Decree 243/2011 "Internationally recognised criteria and parameters for the preliminary evaluation of candidates beneficiaries of the contracts referred to in Art. 24, of Law 240/2010"

Evaluation of qualifications and curriculum:

1. **PhD**
 - 1.1. Related/not related to the academic discipline
 - 1.2. Institution where the qualification was obtained (in a prestigious university in Italy/abroad, etc.)
 - 1.3. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/ sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E)
NOTE: if the candidate does not have any PhD qualification, the related evaluation shall be insufficient / E
2. **University teaching activity**
 - 2.1. Consistency with the academic discipline
 - 2.2. Duration
 - 2.3. Role: professor/teaching assistant/trainer
 - 2.4. Place: national/international
 - 2.5. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/ sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E)
3. **Documented training and/or research activities at qualified Italian and foreign institutes**
 - 3.1. Training and/or research activities related to the academic recruitment field: national/international institute; duration
 - 3.2. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/ sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E)
NOTE: lacking documented activity, or where such activity is shorter than 6 months, the evaluation

shall be "insufficient / E"; if the period of documented activity is equal to or longer than 6 and up to 12 months, the evaluation may not be higher than "fair / C". For periods of activity longer than 12 months, the evaluation shall be "good / B" or "excellent / A" depending on the duration of the activity.

4. Qualifications related to research activity

4.1. Research activities related to the academic discipline: national/international institute; duration

4.2. Participation in projects - Type: national/international

4.3. Participation in projects - Role: participant/coordinator

4.4. Post-PhD activities / research fellowships: Duration

4.5. Post-PhD activities / research fellowships: Consistency with the academic recruitment field

4.6. Post-PhD activities / research fellowships: Places

4.7. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E)

5. Ownership of patents relating to the academic recruitment field indicated in the call where it is provided

5.1. Number of patents. If none, no evaluation shall be given

6. Presentations delivered during national and international congresses and conferences

6.1. Number of presentations during national congresses

6.2. Number of presentations during international congresses

6.3. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E)

7. National and international prizes and awards in research activities

7.1. Type of award (prize, best paper award, etc.)

7.2. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E). If none, no evaluation shall be given

8. Any European specialisation diploma recognised by international boards, in relation to those subject areas indicated in the call in which it is required

8.1. Qualification

8.2. Related / Not related

8.3. Institution where the qualification was obtained (in a prestigious university in Italy/abroad, etc.)

8.4. Overall evaluation: excellent/good/fair/sufficient/insufficient (A / B / C / D / E).

NOTE: If the candidate does not have the title, there will be no evaluation.

The Committee shall deliver its opinion, in order to determine the overall evaluation, on the relevance of the indicators from no. 5 to no. 8, without prejudice to the preponderance of the indicators from no. 1 to no. 4

Evaluation of scientific production:

Only publications or texts accepted for publication according to current regulations as well as essays included in collective works and articles published in journals in paper or digital format shall be considered, with the exclusion of internal notes and departmental reports. The PhD thesis or equivalent qualifications shall be considered even when the above conditions are not met.

Comparative evaluation of scientific production:

a) Evaluation of each publication according to the following criteria:

1. originality, innovativeness, methodological intensity and relevance
2. consistency of each publication with the subject area indicated in the call and with any academic recruitment field that defines the profile
3. scientific relevance of the publishing context of each publication and its dissemination within the scientific community
4. analytical determination, also based on criteria recognised by the international scientific community of reference, on the individual contribution by the author in the case of their participation in collaborative works.

Based on the aforementioned criteria, each publication will be evaluated as follows:

- A: Excellent: the publication ranks in the top 20% of the evaluation scale agreed by the international scientific community;
- B: Good: the publication ranks in the 60% - 80% of the evaluation scale;
- C: Acceptable: the publication ranks in the 50% - 60% of the evaluation scale;
- D: Poor: publication ranks in the lower 50% of the evaluation scale;
- E: Insufficient: not acceptable for scientific purposes.

b) Overall evaluation of scientific production based on the following criteria:

A concise judgement is required on the overall consistency of scientific production, its intensity and temporal continuity, as well as on the analytical evaluation, except periods without research activity because of accidental circumstances, especially in case of parental leaves. The visibility of scientific production in the main bibliographic catalogues (Scopus and ISI-WoS) and, when applicable, the bibliometric indexes (h-index, g-index, etc.) shall also be reported.

Publications shall be evaluated by assigning them (A / B / C / D / E)

1. overall consistency of scientific production
2. intensity
3. temporal continuity (with the exception of duly documented periods of involuntary interruption of the research activity, with particular reference to parental leaves)
4. international visibility (number of works indexed in Scopus or ISI-WoS);
5. impact in the scientific literature (h-index / g-index), if appreciable.

Preliminary evaluation output:

1. collective evaluation report for each candidate
2. ranking of the best candidates evaluated on a comparative basis (with summary scores expressed solely for the purpose of admission to the interview, in the presence of more than 6 candidates), according to the following conversion table:

Key

- A EXCELLENT 100/100
- B GOOD 80/100
- C FAIR 70/100
- D SUFFICIENT 60/100
- E NON SUFFICIENTE/NOT AVAILABLE

Evaluation following the discussion of the qualifications (phase 3):

The Committee shall assign a score:

1. to qualifications: the committee may simply confirm the evaluation made in the preliminary qualification evaluation session or amend it where significant elements have emerged during the discussion of the qualifications with the candidate.
2. for each publication deemed evaluable, the committee may simply confirm the evaluation made in the preliminary evaluation session or amend where significant elements have emerged during the discussion of the qualifications with the candidate.

Moreover, the Committee shall certify the proficiency in the foreign language specified in the call (in relation to the level required by the call itself).

Evaluation output following discussion of qualifications and publications:

1. evaluation report for each candidate (Note: collective reports)

2. duly justified overall collective judgment on the individual candidates, with any individual notes from the commissioners, where necessary.
3. list of the eligible candidates, distributed according to a scale of merit, to be submitted to the department

The number of merit groups shall comply with the values shown in the following table:

	max score	max score		
no. eligible candidates	A	B	C	D
1	1	1		
2	1	1		
3	1	1		
4	1	1		
5	1	1		
6	1	2		
7	1	2		
8	2	2		
9	2	3		
10	2	3		
11	2	3		
12	2	4		
13	2	4		
14	3	4		
15	3	4		
> 15	max 20% *	max 30% *		

* rounding of digit higher than x, 51

For each session, the committee shall draft a special report, according to the formats provided by the Human Resources Area.

- a. originality, innovativeness, methodological intensity and relevance of each publication;
- b. consistency of each publication with the role of associate professor to be covered or with cross-disciplinary topics strictly related to it;
- c. scientific relevance of the publishing context of each publication and its dissemination within the scientific community;
- d. analytical determination, also based on criteria recognised by the international scientific community of reference, on the individual contribution by the author in the case of their participation in collaborative works.

*** Organisational tasks related to teaching and research activities

DISCLAIMER: The English version is a translation of the original in Italian for information purposes only. In case of a discrepancy, the Italian original will prevail.