



Part A

Project Draft Assessment Procedure under Public Call SK-RU RD 2021

1. The Office of the Slovak Research and Development Agency (hereinafter referred to as agency or SRDA) through the application committee appointed by the director of the agency shall assess the submitted applications for fulfilment of technical and formal requirements (hereinafter referred to as “technical requirements”) stated in the public call SK-RU RD 2021.
2. If the application does not meet the technical requirements, the SRDA shall invite the applicant to remedy the deficiencies within 14 days.
3. If the deficiencies of the application are left not remedied under paragraph 2, the SRDA shall decide to reject the application for failure to comply with the technical requirements, and shall notify the applicant of the decision on excluding the application. The decision on excluding the application contains specific reasons for the application’s non-compliance with the technical requirements.
4. The council of the agency (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 two 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 separately for solving the basic research project and separately for solving the applied research and development project.
8. Projects irrelevant to the priorities set out in the call shall be excluded from the assessment process.
9. 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 100.
10. The average point score shall be calculated from the evaluation score points awarded by the independent reviewers, rounded to one decimal place. The average score calculated so is considered as the average rating of the reviewers.
11. **Project quality score by an reviewers (Ukp_E)** classifies the project into one of three groups that express the project quality:
 1. group – excellent- level projects
(Ukp is from a closed interval of 100-87)
 2. group – average- level projects
(Ukp is from an open interval of 87-75)
 3. group – insufficient - level projects
(Ukp is from a closed interval of 75 - 0)

12. The council of the agency first **evaluates the projects** with their overall rankings in **group 3**. For these projects, The council of the agency shall issue a decision not to provide funds due to the insufficient quality of the project proposal. The council of the agency may, in justified cases, reclassify the project from group 3 to group 2, upon the consent of an absolute majority of the voting members. This fact shall be justified in writing.
13. For projects in group 1 or 2, both project rapporteurs shall develop a joint draft of consensus review on the given project, following their mutual discussion. It is structured the same as the evaluations of the reviewers but it includes an aspect of the project budget evaluation and the overall evaluation of the project's positive and negative aspects
14. The consensus review specifies the evaluation of the project by the council of the agency, therefore the council gives to each criterion its own verbal evaluation, and at the same time it specifies classification of each criterion in the appropriate category. Reviews of all the evaluators are automatically copied to the consensus review form for each rating criterion as well as the assignment of categories by individual evaluators to make the members of the council of the agency fully informed.
15. In a consensus review, the project obtains a consensual quality score, which is calculated by the same algorithm as used for calculation of the project quality score based on the reviewers evaluation.
16. A panel discussion is followed by approving a consensus review of each application by the council of the agency for classifying the project into group 1, 2, and eventually group 3 (if resulting so from a consensus review). At the same time, the council shall justify deviations compared to the project evaluators' evaluations, while the council may change the average score by a maximum of **± 5 points**. If the council of the agency changes the average score by more than **± 5 points**, a reasoned and unambiguous justification for that decision must be given.
17. The council of the agency shall approve classification of the projects into individual groups according to their consensus quality score, with the consent of an absolute majority of voting members while voting on each project separately.
18. The council of the agency shall record all material facts and justifications concerning the decisions on the outcome of the evaluation of each application in written.
19. The council of the agency shall approve the list of projects recommended for granting financial support and a list of the projects not recommended for financial support, with the consent of an absolute majority of the voting members.
20. Subsequently, a joint committee shall carry out an international evaluation.
21. The assessment of the joint committee is organised by the Ministry of education, youth and science of SR within the terms agreed with the partner party. Rules for selecting the projects in the International joint committee are as follows:
 - 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 the project assessment on both sides will be addressed in discussion, taking mutual interest into the account.

The final number of the projects selected by the joint committee to be supported depends on the amount of funding allocated to the call in the both participating countries.

22. After completion of the assessment process, i.e. following the evaluation of the joint committee that has agreed a list of the projects recommended for funding, the agency shall notify the applicants of the decision on their applications.

Part B

Basic Project Assessment Criteria

A) APPLICATION RELEVANCY ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE CALL PRIORITIES

(fully/not at all)

In the case of "not at all" a detailed verbal evaluation is required.

In the case of "not at all", the evaluator does not evaluate the application from a professional aspect.

B) PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

1. Timeliness and Science Degree of the Objectives, Scientific Level and Project Quality (0-20 points)

- Assess the relevance of objectives and the relation to the priorities of the call, the timeliness degree of the problem solved in the given field of science and technics
- Assess the project's scientific level and the science degree of the project methods
- Evaluate to what extent the project objectives are clearly defined and achievable in practice
- Assess the correctness and relevance of the proposed project methodology and its effectiveness from meeting the declared objectives point of view
- Assess the justness of international bilateral co-operation in solving the research project

2. Project Originality and Solution Concept (0-20 points)

- Evaluate the project originality extent
- Assess the proposed concept of solution, clarity of the scientific hypothesis formulation
- Evaluate significance of preliminary findings, interlinking the proposed solution to own published findings
- Evaluate relevance of the foreign partner's participation in solving the research project

3. Project Structure, Quality of Processing, Logical Follow-Up of the Solution Procedures (0-20 points)

- Evaluate the level and quality of the content and formal project design, the clarity and the logical follow-up of the procedures and declared objectives
- Assess the clarity, scientific level and adequacy of the methodology used
- Assess the project implementation in terms of timing and scientific objectives
- Assess the project from a financial point of view

4. Professional Qualifications of the Slovak Principal Investigator (0-20 points)

- Evaluate the quality of scientific outputs of the Slovak Principal Investigator
- Evaluate the quality and number of the projects solved led by the Slovak Principal Investigator so far or having cooperated on their management
- Characterise personality of the Slovak Principal Investigator in the given area of fundamental research world-wide, and/or in the European Research Area.

5. Professional Qualifications of the Slovak Research Team (0-10 points)

- Assess the competence level of the Slovak research team to solve the submitted project
 - Assess the competence degree of the individual members of the Slovak research team to solve the submitted project
 - Evaluate ability of the Slovak team members to cooperate, their mutual complementarity and representativeness in the project solution
 - Assess the existing infrastructure of the workplace and its guarantee of quality project solution
 - Assess the level of young R & D staff involvement in the project solution
-

6. Professional Qualifications of the Partner Organisation's Research Team (0-10 points)

- Evaluate the quality of scientific outputs of the partner organisation's Principal Investigator
 - Evaluate the competence level of the partner organisation's research team and of the participating research organisations to solve the submitted project
 - Assess the existing infrastructure of the workplace (s) of the partner organisation and its (their) guarantee of quality project solution
-

In criteria 4 to 6, the reviewers and the Council shall consider time (in the case of women - maternity leave) of active professional life of the Principal Investigator and members of the team.

Part C

Applied Research and Development Project Assessment Criteria

A) APPLICATION RELEVANCY ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE CALL PRIORITIES

(fully/not at all)

If "not at all", a detailed narrative is needed.

If "not at all", the reviewer does not evaluate the Application from a professional point.

B) PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

1. Project Timeliness and Applicability of Research Results and Solution Procedure (0-20 points)

- Assess the relevance of objectives and the relation to the priorities of the call, timeliness of the project objectives for the given field of application science and technology
- Assess timeliness of the proposed solution procedures and the application level of the expected results
- Assess to what extent the project objectives are clearly defined and achievable in practice
- Assess the correctness and relevance of the proposed project methodology and the extent of its ability to meet the declared objectives
- Assess the justness of international bilateral co-operation in solving the research project

2. Originality and Innovative Nature of the Project, Research and Development Significance of the Project results, and the Usability Rate (0-20 points)

- Assess the extent of the project originality
- Identify the benefits of the project to the development of innovations (new products, improved products, new industrial materials, new technologies, new services, etc.)
- Assess the way and extent of applicability of the declared project results for the Applicant/user in SR and abroad
- Define the rate of economic and social benefits of international bilateral co-operation for SR (increasing the share of added value, saving resources, employment effects, domestic raw materials using, improving human resources, protecting the environment)
- Assess the what extent the international bilateral cooperation contributes to the expected benefits

3. Project Structure, Quality of Processing, Logical Follow-Up of the Solution Procedures (0-20 points)

- Evaluate the level and quality of the project processing, comprehensiveness and the logical follow-up of the procedures and the declared objectives
 - Assess the clarity and application-research level of the project methods
 - Assess whether the proposed solution process and its logical context ensure the achievement of declared objectives and application outputs
 - Assess the project from a financial point of view
-

4. Professional Qualifications of the Slovak Principal Investigator (0-20 points)

- Evaluate the quality of application research outputs of the Slovak Principal Investigator
- Evaluate the quality and number of the projects led by the Slovak Principal Investigator so far or having participated on their management
- Evaluate the personality of the Slovak Principal Investigator in the given area of the applied research or experimental development and application of his/her research solutions
- Assess the level of recognition of the leading research team in the applied research (international, European, national levels)

5. Professional Qualifications of the Slovak Research Team (0-10 points)

- Assess the competence degree of the Slovak research team to solve the submitted project
- Assess the competence degree of the individual Slovak research team members to solve the submitted project
- Evaluate ability of the Slovak research team members to cooperate, and their potential contribution to successful project solution
- Assess the existing infrastructure of the workplace and its guarantee for quality project solution and achievement of its objectives
- Assess the level of young R & D staff involvement in the project solution

6. Professional Qualifications of the Partner Organisation's Research Team (0-10 points)

- Evaluate the quality of the applied research outputs of the partner organisation's Principal Investigator
- Evaluate the competence degree of the partner organisation's research team and of the participating research organisations to solve the submitted project
- Assess the existing infrastructure of the workplace (s) of the partner organisation and its (their) guarantee for quality project solution.

In criteria 4 to 6, the reviewers and the Council shall consider time (in the case of women - maternity leave) of active professional life of the Principal Investigator and members of the team.