



ANNEX 2 – ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

Part A

Project Application Assessment Procedure under Public Call VV ZV 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 ZV 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 AVaV 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 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 assessment of the projects will be based on the given assessment criteria.
6. 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 them shall be designated as the Project Lead Reviewer and shall be responsible for preparing the consensus review.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.

10. 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.
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 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.
12. Consensus reviews shall be submitted to the relevant SRDA Council.
13. 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. 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, taking into account the evaluations within the criteria in the following order: 1. Excellence, 2. Impact, and 3. Implementation. The relevant SRDA Council shall be empowered to reduce project budgets while observing the principle of equal treatment.
14. 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. 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, taking into account the evaluations within the criteria in the following order: 1. Excellence, 2. Impact, and 3. Implementation. The relevant SRDA Council shall be empowered to reduce project budgets while observing the principle of equal treatment. 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.
15. The SRDA Council shall then approve the list of projects recommended for financial support and the list of projects not recommended for financial support.
16. 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.
17. The draft decision on all project applications shall be submitted by the SRDA 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
Basic Research Project Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Criterion aspects	Range of scores to be awarded by the reviewer
Excellence	• Evaluate the project concept, the proposed methods of implementation, and the relevance of the expected results. • Assess the significance of preliminary results relevant to the project and the connection of the proposed solution to the applicant's own published results. • Evaluate the degree of timeliness and relevance of the addressed problem in the given field of science and technology, the originality of the project idea, and the originality of its solution. • Assess to what extent the project objectives are clearly defined and realistically achievable. • Evaluate the appropriateness and justification of the proposed project methodology in relation to the achievement of the declared objectives. • Assess the quality of outputs from the principal investigator (including publications, completed projects, and their results, etc.). • Evaluate the expertise of the principal investigator in the given research field, their qualifications, and vision for building a research team, further development of the research, and career progression. • Evaluate the level of expertise of the research team (including individual members) and the participating research organizations in relation to the implementation of the proposed project. • Assess the complementarity, cooperation, and potential substitutability of team members in terms of their expertise and professional contribution to the project. • Evaluate the degree of involvement of young research and development personnel in the project. • Assess whether the project constitutes basic research.	0 – 10
Impact	• Evaluate the measurable indicators and expected outputs of the project. • Evaluate the contribution and usability of the project for the advancement of knowledge and society. • Evaluate the measures for maximizing results and impact, as well as the proposed communication of project outcomes.	0 – 10
Implementation	• Evaluate the quality of the project documentation, the clarity and logical consistency of the proposed procedures and declared goals. • Assess the project plan and outputs – the realization of the project in terms of the timeline, taking into account the established scientific objectives, the individual steps of the work plan with milestones, and their division into work packages. • Assess 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 ability to ensure high-quality project implementation.	0 – 10
Total		30