



ANNEX 2 – ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

Part A

Project Application Assessment Procedure under Public Call VV AVaV 2026

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 Public Call VV AVaV 2026. The Committee shall simultaneously assess compliance with the relevant eligibility criteria required for the inclusion of applications in the evaluation process. In assessing the similarity of applications (projects) to applications (projects) submitted under the Public Call VV ZV 2026, the Committee shall cooperate with the relevant SRDA Councils.
2. The SRDA will request the Applicant to remedy the deficiencies within 14 days if the application does not meet the technical requirements or the application will be excluded from the evaluation process if it does not comply with the rules set in the Consolidated Version of the Public Call.
3. If the deficiencies in the application are not remedied in accordance with paragraph 2 or the criteria for including the application in the evaluation process are not met, SRDA shall decide to reject the application for non-compliance with the technical requirements or criteria 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 or criteria.
4. The SRDA Council (hereinafter referred to as "the Council") shall appoint two of its members to be a rapporteur for each evaluated application.
5. The agency shall provide three independent reviews prepared by foreign expert in the given field for each application complying with the technical and formal requirements. The reviews may be prepared in Slovak, Czech or English languages. The reviews are the basis for the application evaluation by the council of the agency. The council of the agency may set up a working group in the evaluation of applications pursuant to §15 sect. 11 of Act No. 172/2005 Coll. as amended.
6. Assessing the project quality is the basic principle for assessing the application for project funding.
7. Application assessment shall be done based on the assessment criteria set in Part B of this Annex.
8. The evaluator shall provide a verbal evaluation of compliance with the criterion. At the same time, the evaluator shall allocate points to the given criterion from the range of points set for each criterion. The maximum number of points for the application evaluation from one evaluator is 30 points. The scoring scale is set at 1 point.

9. Weighted average median rounded to two decimal places shall be calculated from the scores given by the evaluators. The score thus obtained shall be considered the weighted average median score of the project given by the evaluators. To calculate the weighted average median of the scores, following formula shall be used:

$$\text{Weighted average median} = \frac{B - \left\{ \frac{[10 - k(B - A)]}{10} \times (B - A) \right\} + B + B + \left\{ \frac{[10 - k(C - B)]}{10} \times (C - B) \right\}}{3}$$

where:

A is the lowest given score

B is the medium given score

C is the highest given score

k is the coefficient; k = 2/5

10. The sum of the weighted average of the scores of all the criteria determined under point 9 shall be considered as the weighted average score of the application proposal by the reviewers.
11. 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 weighted average of the scores for each criterion determined in accordance with point 9 must be at least 6 points;
 - b) The weighted average score of the application proposal as determined by the assessors in accordance with point 10 shall be at least 22 points.
12. The weighted average score of the application of the individual criteria under point 10 shall be considered as the final score of the application proposal by the reviewers.
13. The Council shall first evaluate projects considered to be of insufficient quality. For such projects, the Council shall issue a proposal for a decision not to award funding on the grounds of the insufficient quality of the project proposal. In justified cases, the Council may decide to advance a project to the next stage of the evaluation process, subject to the approval of a simple majority of the voting members. Such a decision shall be justified in writing.
14. For projects for which the Council has not issued a proposal for a decision not to award funding due to the insufficient quality of the project proposal, the two rapporteurs shall, following prior mutual discussion, prepare a joint draft consensus review of the project. The consensus review shall have the same structure as the individual reviewers' evaluations; however, it shall additionally include an assessment of the project budget and an overall evaluation of the project's strengths and weaknesses.
15. The consensus review reflects the Council's assessment of the project. Therefore, the Council shall provide its own narrative evaluation for each criterion. For the information of the Council members, the evaluations of all reviewers for each assessment criterion shall be automatically copied into the consensus review form.
16. Following the Council discussion, the Council shall approve the consensus review for each application (and, where justified by the conclusions of the consensus review, may also issue a proposal for a decision not to award funding due to the insufficient quality of additional project proposals). The Council shall provide a justification for any deviations from the reviewers' evaluations. The Council may adjust the average score by no more

than ± 3 points. The Council is entitled to apply budget reductions to projects recommended for funding, while ensuring compliance with the principle of equal treatment.

17. The Council shall record in writing all material facts and justifications relating to decisions on the outcome of the evaluation of each application. Each project shall be assessed individually as well as in the context of all projects under evaluation.
18. The Council shall approve the list of projects recommended for funding and the list of projects not recommended for funding by a simple majority of the voting members.
19. The Council shall issue a proposal for a decision to award or not to award funding for individual projects, taking into account both the evaluation results and the amount of funding available to the Agency under the respective call.
20. The draft decision on all project applications shall be submitted by the Council to the Director of the Agency.

In the relevant criteria, international expert panels and Agency Councils take into account the time of the active professional life of the principal investigator the research team members, especially with regard to the maternity and parental leave. These circumstances shall be assessed with the aim of ensuring equal opportunities and preventing the disadvantage or discrimination of early-career researchers and individuals at an earlier stage of their research careers.

Part B

Applied Research and Development Project Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Criterion aspects	Range of scores to be awarded by the reviewer
Excellence	• Evaluate the project concept, the proposed procedures for implementation, and the application level of the expected results. • Evaluate the significance of preliminary results relevant to the project and the connection of the proposed solution to the applicant's previously published results. • Assess the timeliness and relevance of the addressed problem in the specific field of science and technology, the originality of the project idea, and the originality of its solution. • Evaluate to what extent the project objectives are clearly defined and realistically achievable. • Assess the appropriateness and justification of the proposed methodology in relation to fulfilling the declared objectives. • Evaluate the quality of applied research outputs from the principal investigator. • Assess the expertise of the principal investigator in the given area of applied research or experimental development and the application of their research solutions. • Evaluate the expertise, competence, and vision for building a research team, further research, and career development. • Assess the level of competence of the involved research and implementation organizations in solving the proposed project. • Evaluate the competence of individual members of the research team in solving the proposed project. • Assess the level of involvement of young research and development workers in the project. • Evaluate whether the project qualifies as applied research or development.	0 – 10
Impact	• Assess the project's contributions to the advancement of knowledge, applied research and development, and innovations (new products or procedures, improved products or procedures, new functional materials, new technologies, new services, social innovations, etc.). • Evaluate the applicability and extent of usability of the declared project results for the applicant/user in Slovakia and abroad. • Assess the level of economic benefit (increase in added value, resource savings, impact on employment, use of domestic raw materials, improvement of human resources, enhancement of quality of life and/or health, environmental protection). • Evaluate the measures planned to maximize project results and impact, and the planned communication of project outcomes. • Assess the measurable indicators of the project.	0 – 10
Implementation	• Evaluate the quality of the project documentation, the clarity and logical coherence of the procedures and declared objectives. • Assess the project plan and outputs – the implementation of the project in terms of timeline, considering the set scientific goals, the individual steps of the work plan with milestones, and their division into work packages. • Evaluate project management and processes within the framework of project management. • Assess the risks of project implementation in relation to the expected outputs and the strategies for their mitigation. • Assess the project from a financial perspective. • Evaluate the existing infrastructure of the workplace(s) and its/their guarantee of high-quality project implementation and the achievement of its goals.	0 – 10
Total		30