

EXPERT EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSAL FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCHER GROUPS PROJECTS

Registration number of proposal
 Project title
 Principal investigator

I. Have the project implementers planned due solutions for ethical issues related to project activities?

YES NO NOT APPLICABLE

If NO, please explain:

II. Evaluation according to other criteria:

Evaluation criterion ¹	Maximum possible score ²	Threshold score	Explanation of evaluation (mandatory)
1. Significance and validity of the idea			
1.1. Originality and novelty of the idea <i>It is evaluated whether the idea raised in the project is original and new in terms of scientific development and / or international perspective</i>	5	3	
1.2. Relevance of the idea, potential contribution to development in the research field/fields <i>It is evaluated whether the aim of the project is sufficiently ambitious, whether the project will contribute to the solution of current scientific problems, as well as the expected progress compared to the state of research on this topic, possible social benefits or practical value of the project</i>	5	3	
1.3. Rationality of the objectives, methods and the work schedule and validity of possible risk forecast and management <i>It is evaluated whether the project objectives are clearly formulated, correspond to the aim of the project, the appropriate methods are selected, the project work plan is rational to solve the planned objectives and obtain the project output, the potential risks are foreseen and their management is discussed in order to implement the project in a timely and proper manner</i>	5	3	

2. Potential of project implementers group to implement the project			
2.1. Scientific competence of the principal investigator <i>Publications of the principal investigator, work in the project topic and / or project research field (fields) are evaluated, taking into account the investigator's experience in implementing projects</i>	5	2	
2.2. Compliance of project implementers group's composition with the implementation of the project objectives <i>Suitability and optimality of the whole project implementers group (including the principal investigator) for the project implementation are evaluated</i>	5	2	
3. Importance, publication and dissemination of the planned project results <i>The compliance of the planned project results with the objectives, the quality and level of completeness of the planned scientific publications, as well as the general importance of the planned project results and their dissemination to the scientific and general public are evaluated</i>	5	2	
Total score:	30³	18⁴	

¹ Projects will be ranked by total score in descending order. If multiple proposals are awarded the same total score, the proposal complying with following conditions in that particular order is ranked higher: 1) total score according to the criteria 1.1 and 1.2 is higher, 2) total score according to the criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 is higher, 3) total score according to the criteria 2.1 and 2.2 is higher, 4) score according to the criterion 2.1 is higher. These conditions will be checked until all proposals are ranked in priority order. If these conditions are insufficient, the expert commission must collegially determine the ranking of the proposal after an additional analysis of such proposals.

² Score meaning:

- 5 – ‘Excellent’. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘excellent’ if, taking into account all aspects of its evaluation, there are no shortcomings or they are insignificant. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the advantages of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).
- 4 – ‘Good’. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘good’ if, taking into account all aspects of its evaluation, there are only minor shortcomings. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).
- 3 – ‘Acceptable’. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘acceptable’ if not all aspects of its evaluation can be assessed well, but the existing shortcomings do not jeopardize the implementation of the project and / or do not significantly reduce the quality of the project. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).
- 2 – ‘Weak’. According to the relevant criterion, the proposal has significant shortcomings. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).
- 1 – ‘Poor’. According to the relevant criterion, the proposal is evaluated negatively. Significant shortcomings are substantiated; including lack of information (arguments) to justify specific aspects of the evaluation (mandatory).
- 0 – the proposal cannot be evaluated by the relevant criterion due to insufficient information.

³ Total maximum possible score is equal to total sum of maximum possible scores according to each criterion.

⁴ Total threshold score is set 3 points higher than total sum of threshold scores according to each criterion.

III. Is the project cost estimate well planned for the achievement of the project objectives, are the project funds intended to be used efficiently and reasonably?

- YES NO

If NO, please explain, by stating, if necessary, for which activities costs are proposed to change, how much and what costs are proposed to exclude:

IV. Other remarks

.....

V. Final conclusion (the project is declared not eligible for funding if at least one of the following is true: 1) the proposal is evaluated negatively under the evaluation criterion I, 2) the proposal receives less than the threshold score under at least one of the other criteria, 3) the total score under all criteria is less than 18):

- PROJECT IS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING
- PROJECT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

I, the undersigned expert, certify that I will have no direct or indirect tangible or intangible benefit in the event of the success or failure of this project.

Expert
(*In case of individual evaluation*)

.....
(*First name, last name*)

Head of the expert commission
(*In case of summary evaluation*)

.....
(*First name, last name*)

Date
