



ANNEX 2 – ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

Part A

Project Draft Assessment Procedure under Public Call VV MVP 2024

1. The Office of the Slovak Research and Development Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency" or "SRDA"), through the applications Committee appointed by the Director of the Agency, will evaluate the submitted applications for compliance with the technical and formal requirements (hereinafter referred to as "the technical requirements") specified in the VV MVP 2024 Public Call.
2. The SRDA will request the Applicant to remedy the deficiencies within 14 days if the application does not meet the technical requirements.
3. If the deficiencies in the application are not remedied in accordance with paragraph 2, the SRDA shall decide to reject the application for non-compliance with the technical requirements and shall notify the Applicant of the decision to reject the application. The decision to reject the application shall include the specific reasons for the non-compliance of the application with the technical requirements.
4. The SRDA Council (hereinafter referred to as "the Council") shall submit projects to the International Expert Panels (hereinafter referred to as "the Panel") it has established according to the fields of science and technology.
5. The Panels will jointly assess projects in basic research, applied research & development.
6. The assessment of the projects will be based on the assessment criteria established separately for the basic research project and for the applied research & development project.
7. For each project to be evaluated, the Chairperson of the Panel shall appoint two reviewers from among the Panel members based on their expertise, who shall deliver their reviews prior to the Panel meeting itself. One of the reviewers so appointed shall be designated as the Project Lead Reviewer and shall be responsible for preparing the consensus review.
8. The basic principle of the evaluation is to assess the overall level of quality of the project, based on three criteria: 1. Excellence; 2. Impact; 3. Implementation.
9. The reviewer will provide a narrative and scored assessment of the fulfilment of the criteria, assigning a score of 0 – 10 points to each criterion. The scoring scale is set at 1 point. The maximum total score for the reviewer's assessment of the project is 30 points.
10. The Panel will discuss each project individually and all projects in their interconnectedness, based on the provided reviews. The Panel shall determine the final score for each criterion for each project, which it shall approve at the end of the meeting.

11. On the basis of the approved final scores for each criterion, the Project Lead Reviewer will prepare a consensus review taking into account the conclusions of the Panel's assessment.
12. Projects that do not meet any of the following conditions will not proceed to the next evaluation stage due to lack of quality:
 - a) The project must score at least 6 points in each criterion;
 - b) The project's total score for all criteria is at least 22.

Projects that do not meet either of the above conditions will not be supported for lack of quality.
13. Each criterion has its own weight. Once the final assessment has been agreed by the panels, the criteria will be weighted as follows: a) Excellence – 1.5 times achieved number of points per criterion; b) Impact – 0.8 times achieved number of points per criterion; c) Implementation – 0.7 times achieved number of points per criterion.
14. Consensus reviews, after applying the weights for each criterion, shall be submitted to the relevant SRDA Council.
15. Where a single panel is set up with the SRDA Council, the SRDA Council shall establish a list of projects recommended for financial support and a list of projects not recommended for financial support on the basis of the final assessment approved by the Panel after applying the weights of the individual criteria. Where it is not possible to support all projects with the same final assessment given the amount of funds available, the relevant SRDA Council shall decide, based on consensus reviews, which of these projects shall be supported, by taking into account the assessment of the criterion of Excellence. The relevant SRDA Council shall be empowered to reduce project budgets.
16. Where more than one panel is established under the SRDA Council, the relevant SRDA Council shall establish a joint ranking of projects on the basis of the final assessment agreed in the panels after applying the weights of the individual criteria. If it is not possible to support all projects with the same final ranking given the amount of funds available, the relevant SRDA Council shall decide by consensus reviews which of these projects shall be supported, by taking into account the assessment of the criterion of Excellence. The relevant SRDA Council shall be empowered to reduce project budgets. On the basis of the established consensus reviews ranking of projects, the SRDA Council shall establish a list of projects recommended for financial support and a list of projects not recommended for financial support.
17. The SRDA Council shall then approve the list of projects recommended for financial support and the list of projects not recommended for financial support.
18. The SRDA Council shall prepare a draft decision on the award or non-award of grants to individual projects, taking into account the evaluation of the projects and the amount of the Agency's budget available for the Call.
19. The draft decision on all project applications shall be submitted by the SRDA Council to the Director of the Agency.

Part B
Basic Project Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Criterion aspects	Range of scores to be awarded by the reviewer	Criterion weight	Maximum weighted score
Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the topicality of the addressed problem in the given field of science and technology, the originality of the project idea and the originality of its implementation. • Evaluate the clarity of project objectives and their feasibility. • Assess the correctness and validity of the proposed methodology of the project and its effectiveness in achieving the stated objectives. • Evaluate the quality of the scientific output of the Principal Investigator. • Evaluate the quality and results of the projects carried out by the Principal Investigator. • Evaluate credentials of the Principal Investigator in the given research area, his/her expertise and vision for building a research team, further research development and career growth. • Evaluate the competence of the research team (including individual members) and of the participating research organisations to carry out the project. • Assess the ability of the project team members to cooperate, their complementarity and substitutability in the project. • Evaluate the involvement of young R&D personnel in the project. • Evaluate whether it is a basic research project. 	0 – 10	1.50	15
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the significance of preliminary results relevant to the project; how the proposed implementation links with own published results. • Evaluate the applicability of the project to the development of knowledge and society. • Evaluate the measures taken to maximise the results and impact and how the project's results will be communicated. 	0 – 10	0.80	8
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the quality of project design, clarity and logical consistency of procedures and stated objectives. • Assess the project plan and deliverables-roadmap, individual milestones and work packages. • Assess how the project will be managed. • Assess the implementation risks in relation to the expected results and how they will be mitigated. • Assess the the project's budget and how it will be used. • Evaluate the existing infrastructure of the involved organizations and how they ensure a quality project implementation. 	0 – 10	0.70	7
				30

Part C

Applied Research and Development Project Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Criterion aspects	Range of scores to be awarded by the reviewer	Criterion weight	Maximum weighted score
Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the proposed implementation and the applicability of the expected results. • Evaluate the degree of topicality of the addressed problem in the given field of science and technology, the originality of the project idea and the originality of its implementation. • Evaluate the clarity of project objectives and their feasibility. • Assess the correctness and validity of the methodology proposed for the project and the extent to which it is capable of achieving the stated objectives. • Evaluate the quality of the application research outputs of the Principal Investigator. • Evaluate the credentials of the Principal Investigator in the given field of applied research or experimental development and how the results of his/her research were used. • Evaluate the recognition of the Principal Investigator in the field of applied research, his/her expertise and vision for research team building, research development and career development. • Evaluate the competence of the participating research and implementing organisations to tackle the project. • Evaluate the competence of the individual members of the research team to participate in the submitted project. • Evaluate the involvement of young R&D personnel in the project. • Evaluate whether it is an applied research or development project. 	0 – 10	1.50	15
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the benefits of the project for the development of innovation (new products, improved products, new utility materials, new technologies, new services, etc.). • Assess how the applicant and/or the beneficiary in the Slovak Republic and abroad will use declared results of the project. • Assess the economic benefit of the project (increase in the share of added value, saving of resources, impact on employment, use of domestic raw materials, improvement of human resources, protection of the environment). • Assess the measures to maximise results and impact and how the project results will be communicated. 	0 – 10	0.80	8
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the quality of project design, clarity and logical consistency of procedures and stated objectives. • Assess the implementation risks of the project implementation in relation to the expected results and how they can be mitigated. • Evaluate the work plan and deliverables - roadmap, individual milestones, work packages. • Assess how the project will be managed. • Assess the project's budget and how it will be used. • Evaluate the existing infrastructure of the involved organizations and how they ensure a quality project implementation. 	0 – 10	0.70	7
				30