



## **ANNEX 2 – ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA**

---

### **Part A**

#### **Project Draft Assessment Procedure under Public Call SK-AT RD 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 SK-AT RD 2026 Public Call.
2. SRDA will request the Applicant to remedy the deficiencies within 14 days if the application does not meet the technical requirements or application shall not be subject of the evaluation process and will be rejected if does not comply with the rules form the Consolidated Version of the Call.
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. Council of the Agency shall appoint one of its members to be a rapporteur for each evaluated application.
5. The Agency shall provide three independent reviews prepared by national and 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.
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 one decimal point 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.

Projects that do not meet either of the above conditions will not be supported for lack of quality.
12. The sum of the resulting scores of the individual criteria under point 10 shall be considered as the final score of the application proposal by the reviewers.
13. Based on an assessment of project proposals, the Council of the Agency may adjust, downward or upward, the average score of project reviewers by up to **± 3 points**.
14. Council of the Agency shall prepare ranking of the projects according to the final number of points obtained, and identify the projects recommended for funding.
15. Subsequently, an international assessment shall be carried out by a joint committee.
16. The Ministry of Education, Science, Research, Development and Youth of the Slovak Republic organizes the evaluation of the joint commission within the terms agreed with the partner country. Rules for selecting the projects in an international joint commission are as follows:
  - the projects not submitted or unrated on both sides will be excluded due to non-compliance with the terms of the Call;
  - two-sided highly rated projects at national levels will benefit against the projects that are assessed differently;
  - differences in project assessment on both sides will be addressed in discussion, taking mutual interest into the account.

Final number of the projects selected to be supported by the joint committee depends on the amount of funds allocated to the Call in all the participating countries.

17. The Council of the Agency issues a draft decision on funding for individual projects taking into account the projects evaluation as well as the amount of available funds allocated for the applications in the given Call.
18. The draft decision on funding for all submitted applications shall be submitted by the Council of the Agency to the director of the Agency.

## Part B

### Evaluation criteria for assessing a basic research project

---

#### **(A) ASSESSMENT OF THE RELEVANCE OF THE APPLICATION TO THE FOCUS OF THE CALL (BASIC RESEARCH)**

(fully/not at all)

In case the project is *not at all* relevant to the priorities of the Call a detailed justification is required and the project is not further assessed

#### **B) EXPERT EVALUATION OF THE APPLICATION**

##### **1. Excellence (0-10 points)**

- The topicality of the project's objectives for the given field of science and technology on an international scale, the relationship between the project's objectives and the priorities of the Call
- The degree of originality of the project, the scientific level of the project and the topicality of the proposed approaches
- The project objectives, the scientific hypothesis, the proposed methodology and the planned outputs of the project
- The justification for international cooperation
- The scientific outputs and professional quality of the Principal Investigator and individual members of the research team
- The scientific outputs and professional quality of the Principal Investigator of the partner organisations and the individual members of the research team of the partner organisations
- Evaluate whether the project is a basic research project

##### **2. Impact (0-10 points)**

- The relevance of the preliminary results, the continuity of the proposed implementation with the published results
- The contribution of the expected results of the project to the development of the discipline and indicate the potential relevance of the findings to practice
- The need for participation of foreign partners in the research project and their contribution to the project outputs, the impact of the project on the development of further international cooperation
- The ways of disseminating project outputs
- The involvement of PhD. students and/or young R&D personnel in the project and their potential for professional development resulting from their participation in the project

##### **3. Implementation (0-10 points)**

- The objectives and timeline of the project with regard to the logical continuity of the implementation procedures and the fulfilment of the stated objectives
- The cooperation plan of Slovak and foreign researchers and their contribution to the project
- The adequacy of the project design methods in the context of its implementation
- The adequacy of the requested funding in the context of the planned research and bilateral activities and the achievement of the objectives
- The stated existing instrumentation and personnel infrastructure of the departments of the Slovak and foreign institutions involved in the implementation of the project

- The risk factors potentially threatening the implementation of the project and measures to minimise them

**In the relevant criteria, the reviewers and the Agency Council take into account the time of the active professional life of the Principal Investigator and the research team members, especially with regard to the maternity and parental leave.**