



CHAIRMAN OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF LITHUANIA

**ORDER
ON THE APPROVAL OF THE GENERAL RULES OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF
LITHUANIA FOR THE COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF RESEARCH AND
DISSEMINATION PROJECTS**

April 4, 2019, No. V-176
Vilnius

Following the Regulations of the Research Council of Lithuania approved by the Seimas (Lithuanian Parliament) of the Republic of Lithuania on June 22, 2017, Resolution XIII-499 'On the Approval of the Regulations of the Research Council of Lithuania', Clause 23.14 and taking into account the proposals delivered in the protocol decision of the Committee on Humanities and Social Sciences of March 18, 2019 HSM-P-8 09 and of the Committee on Natural and Technical Sciences of February 18, 2019 GTM-P-7 and February 25, 2019 GTM-P-8 of the Research Council of Lithuania (hereinafter referred to as the Council):

1. I a p p r o v e the General Rules of the Research Council of Lithuania for the Competitive Funding of Research and Dissemination Projects (hereinafter referred to as the Rules) attached.

2. I d e f i n e that:

2.1. The rules apply to projects of national research programmes, researcher groups and international programmes. The provisions of the Rules may also apply to other areas of activities funded by the Council, as provided for in the legislation governing the administration of these areas and to the extent that they do not contradict with them.

2.2. Calls for proposals published before the entry into force of the Rules adopted in accordance with Clause 1 of this Order shall be governed by provisions of the general rules of the Research Council of Lithuania for the competitive funding of research and dissemination projects approved by the Chairman of the Council of Lithuania Order of January 29, 2018 V-45 'On the Approval of the General Rules of the Research Council of Lithuania for the Competitive Funding of Research and Dissemination Projects' as regards the submission, evaluation, selection, and grant agreement signing procedures. The implementation of projects selected for funding under these calls shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Rules approved by this Order (Chapters I-II, Sections II-IV of Chapter V, and Chapters VI-VII of the Rules).

2.3. For projects implemented in accordance with the grant agreements signed before the entry into force of the Rules approved by Clause 1 of this Order, the provisions of the Rules governing the implementation of projects (Chapters I-II, V-VII of the Rules) shall apply.

3. I d e c l a r e void the Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania Order of January 29, 2018 V-45 'On the Approval of the General Rules of the Research Council of Lithuania for the Competitive Funding of Research and Dissemination Projects' as amended from January 1, 2020.

Vice Chairman,
Interim Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania

Ričardas Rotomskis

Vaiva Priudokienė
03/04/2019

APPROVED by
Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania
Order of April 4, 2019, V-176

GENERAL RULES OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF LITHUANIA FOR THE COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION PROJECTS

CHAPTER I GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The general rules of the Research Council of Lithuania for the competitive funding of research and dissemination projects (hereinafter referred to as the Rules) establish the procedure for the allocation of state budget funds administered by the Research Council of Lithuania (hereinafter referred to as the Council) for research and dissemination projects (hereinafter referred to as the Project) and the procedure for administering these projects. The provisions of the Rules shall apply to an extent that they do not contradict with the provisions of the programme approved by the Government of the Republic of Lithuania or the Minister of Education, Science, and Sport international programmes or agreements and calls for proposals.

2. Terms used within the Rules:

2.1. 'appeal' means a motivated written address to the Council by the appellant stating that he/she is not in agreement with the decision of the Chairman of the Council adopted on the basis of an administrative check of the proposal or an expert evaluation of a proposal or a report;

2.2. 'appellant' means a principal investigator who, together with the implementing institution, delivers the appeal on the decision of the Chairman of the Council on the administrative check of the proposal or an expert evaluation of a proposal or a report;

2.3. 'bilateral commission' means the commission of the bilateral co-operation programme, which is responsible for coordinating the programme and adopting decisions on its implementation. Lithuanian representatives of the bilateral commission are approved by the Minister of Education, Science, and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania;

2.4. 'bilateral (tripartite) committee' means the committee of the bilateral (tripartite) co-operation programme which is responsible for coordinating the programme, adopting decisions on its implementation and managing common resources. Lithuanian representatives of the bilateral (tripartite) committee are approved by the Minister of Education, Science, and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania;

2.5. 'research project' means the entire range of the research, the dissemination of the research results and other related activities and organisational actions performed by the project implementers (or an individual researcher) for the foreseen time to address the foreseen scientific tasks; in case of international programmes, the research project is considered to be a part of an international project implemented by the project implementer from Lithuania;

2.6. 'national research (research and development) programme' (hereinafter referred to as NRP) means a programme that includes the entire range of research, methods and measures necessary for them to perform, create the conditions for addressing issues of strategic importance to state and society and enhance the competitiveness of Lithuanian science;

2.7. 'secondary project implementer' means a person who carries out the work assigned to him/her for the purpose to achieve objectives of the project and thereby contributes to the implementation of the project;

2.8. 'primary project implementer' means a person who carries out the main project work which usually lasts for the duration of the project, and whose scientific competence is relevant for the evaluation of the proposals. The principal investigator is also considered the primary project implementer;

2.9. ‘proposal’ means a document submitted by the principal investigator and other primary project implementers (together with the implementing institution) to the Council or other institution, which administers the call of the international programme to obtain funding for the implementation of the project;

2.10. ‘project partner’ means public or private legal entity that, together with the implementing institution, created the conditions for project implementers for the implementation of the project;

2.11. ‘principal investigator’ means a scientist who, together with the project implementers, implements the project and manages its implementation, or a scientist who implements the project alone;

2.12. ‘project implementer’ means a primary project implementer and/or a secondary project implementer referred to in Clause 2.7 and 2.8 of the Rules;

2.13. ‘dissemination project’ means a set of activities and actions carried out by the project implementer (or an individual researcher) within a given time frame in order to address the tasks defined in the project and disseminate and publish the results of previously performed research;

2.14. ‘international programme’ means an initiative to coordinate national research programmes (e.g. ERA-NET initiative); a bilateral (tripartite) cooperation programme implemented in accordance with an international agreement (contract) in the field of research and experimental development, the implementation of which involves the Council; an initiative, which is being implemented under the bilateral cooperation agreement between the Council and the institution of a foreign country in the field of research; COST programme;

2.15. ‘international project’ means a project selected in accordance with the rules of the international programme implemented by the project implementers together with the implementing institution (project partner) and the international project partners;

2.16. ‘international project partner’ means public or private legal entity implementing an international project from a foreign country participating in the international programme;

2.17. ‘implementing institution’ means a Lithuanian research and higher education institution which is included in the Register of Education and Research institutions and creates conditions for the project implementers for the implementation of the project, managing the state budget funds allocated to the project following the procedures stated in the legal acts, as well as representing the project partners (if applicable). The implementing institution, if indicated in the call for proposals, may also be the academy of sciences mentioned in the Law on Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Lithuania, or a national, state, or county public library, a state archive, a national or republican museum, a state healthcare institution;

2.18. ‘implementing group’ means a group of scientists and other researchers, practitioners and public sector representatives approved by the Chairman of the Council which manages and coordinates the NRP, competition-based priority research programme or State Programme for Lithuanian Research and Dissemination for 2016-2024 (hereinafter referred to as the Lithuanian Studies Programme) and is responsible for the achievement of its objectives and tasks;

2.19. ‘Recommendations’ mean The Recommendations to the preparation, approval, and implementation of academic ethics codes in research and education institutions, approved by order of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures (hereinafter referred to as the Ombudsperson) of August 25, 2020, V-38 “On the approval of Recommendations to the preparation, approval, and implementation of academic ethics codes in research and education institutions”;

2.20. ‘competition-based priority research programme’ (hereinafter referred to as the PRP) means a programme, which, having gathered the intellectual potential of the State, serves to resolve an issue of strategic importance to the State and society, affecting the development of the State and science and the purpose of which shall be the new scientific knowledge and intellectual products, new infrastructure for scientific research and raising the competence of researchers.

Other terms used in the Rules correspond to those used in the Law on Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Lithuania.

CHAPTER II GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS AND PROJECT COSTS

SECTION 1 REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS

3. The proposals may be submitted by the project implementer(s) together with the implementing institution and, if necessary for the implementation of a project, by the project partner(s) and/or international project partner(s).

4. A person may submit only one proposal for the same call as a principal investigator or other primary project implementer, unless indicated otherwise in the call for proposals.

5. A person may submit a proposal only when on the last day of the call for proposals he/she is not subject to any proposal consideration restrictions set out in Clauses 72-75 of the Rules.

6. When submitting a proposal a person shall take into account that from the beginning until the end of the implementation of the project indicated in the proposal he/she can be a project implementer of no more than two projects funded by the Council and the principal investigator of only one of them. This includes the following activities supported by the Council:

6.1. NRP;

6.2. PRP;

6.3. Research projects of the Lithuanian Studies programme;

6.4. Researcher groups projects.

7. The project implementer(s) shall conclude the project implementation employment or an agreement(s) equivalent in essence with the implementing institution or the project partner(s) in accordance with the following requirements:

7.1. the project implementers shall be employed in those positions whose qualification requirements, set by the implementing institution or project partner(s), they meet;

7.2. the work scope of each primary project implementer within the project must be at least 20 hours of project time multiplied by the duration of the project in months;

7.3. the remuneration determined for the project implementers must be calculated within the maximum hourly remuneration approved by the Chairman of the Council;

7.4. the principal investigator shall be employed by the implementing institution.

8. The provisions set out in the Clause 7 shall apply if remuneration, social insurance and other contributions are considered as eligible costs unless otherwise specified in the call for proposals.

SECTION 2 REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECT COSTS

9. Project costs:

9.1. 'direct costs' means the costs necessary for completing the tasks of a specific project;

9.2. 'indirect costs' means costs that are not directly related to the tasks of the project but that are necessary to create the conditions to complete them.

10. The following types of direct costs are eligible (unless otherwise stated in the international programme documents or call for proposals):

10.1. remuneration of the project implementers;

10.2. social insurance and other contributions of the project implementers;

10.3. service costs (excluding copyright works);

10.4. costs of copyright works;

10.5. costs for goods;

10.6. costs for the secondments of the project implementers;

10.7. costs for the acquisition of non-current tangible and intangible assets.

11. The following groups of indirect costs are eligible:

11.1. remuneration, social insurance and other contributions of the persons managing the project (excluding the principal investigator);

11.2. costs for the usage of goods and services.

12. Indirect costs of the project cannot exceed 30% of the direct costs of the project, provided for in Clauses 10.1-10.4 of the Rules, unless otherwise specified in the documents of the international programme or in the call for proposals. Exceptional cases may include additional indirect costs for the operation of scientific equipment.

13. Costs incurred during the implementation of a project are recognised as eligible if they are:

13.1. realistic and based on the financial documents, justification of the costs and proof of payment or equivalent probative value documents;

13.2. incurred by the implementing institution or project partner(s) from Lithuania;

13.3. incurred during the project implementation period specified in the project grant agreement;

13.4. intended exclusively for the achievement of the objectives of the project and the achievement of the intended results, are necessary and in accordance with the principles of economy and efficiency;

13.5. accounted for by the implementing institution or project partner(s) in accordance with the accounting principles and internal rules;

13.6. incurred in accordance with the provisions of the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Lithuania;

13.7. corresponding to the types of direct costs referred to in Clause 10 of the Rules or the groups of indirect costs referred to in Clause 11 of the Rules and other requirements specified in the project grant agreement;

13.8. purchase Value Added Tax (hereinafter referred to as VAT) relating to the funds allocated to the project for purchases of goods or services. The VAT paid on project funds cannot be included in the VAT return and VAT declaration.

14. Ineligible project implementation costs:

14.1. foreign exchange losses and currency exchange charges;

14.2. interest on debt, purchase of land or immovable property;

14.3. fines, default interest and litigation costs;

14.4. non-monetary contribution;

14.5. study costs;

14.6. payments made to the project implementers under service and/or copyright agreements;

14.7. costs under service and/or copyright agreements if they are concluded for the principal implementation assignments of the project;

14.8. costs acquiring non-current tangible and intangible assets incurred by the implementing institution or the project partner(s) that are not a Lithuanian state institution;

14.9. declared, incurred or reimbursed costs related to the other projects carried out by the implementing and/or the partner institution(s);

14.10. costs on the scientific review of research and dissemination results (output).

CHAPTER III PROPOSAL COMPETITION

SECTION 1 CALL FOR AND SUBMITTING OF PROPOSALS

15. Proposals shall be submitted on the basis of calls announced by the Council or other institution managing the call of the international programme.

16. The Council shall issue a call for proposals or information on a call for proposals published under the international programme on the Council's website www.lmt.lt.

17. The call for proposals shall specify the general provisions for the submission of proposals as set out in the Rules and, following the order of the Chairman of the Council, approve specific requirements for a specific competition, as well as other information.

18. Proposals shall be submitted in Lithuanian on the Council's electronic system unless otherwise specified in the international programme documents or call for proposals.

19. The proposal shall be accompanied with is the mandatory supplementary document - the letter of the implementing institution - and the annexes unless otherwise specified in the international programme documents or call for proposals. The forms of the proposal and the letter of the implementing institution shall be approved by the order of the Chairman of the Council.

20. If a call for proposals is published by an institution administering a call of the international programme, proposals shall be prepared and submitted in accordance with the rules of the international programme and the requirements specified within the call. When publishing the information on the call of the international programme, the Council may impose additional requirements for project implementers.

21. After the deadline for submitting proposals, the proposals will no longer be accepted.

SECTION 2 PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION

22. After the deadline for the receipt of proposals, their administrative check and expert evaluation are performed.

23. The administrative check is carried out by the Research Foundation of the Council (hereinafter referred to as the Research Foundation), unless otherwise specified in the international programme documents. The administrative check shall verify that the proposals submitted to the competition meet the requirements of the Rules and/or the international programme and the call. If it is found that the proposal contains minor non-conformities of the requirements, the principal investigator may be given the opportunity to eliminate them within two working days following the day of sending the principal investigator a notice to the email indicated in the proposal. Minor non-conformities are as follows:

23.1. non-submitted or incorrectly submitted data in the letter of the implementing institution;

23.2. non-submitted or incorrectly submitted annexes to the proposal indicated in the call.

24. In the course of the call under the international programme, if the administrative institution performing the administrative check of the proposal submitted finds that there is a lack of information or data, the Research Foundation has the right to request the principal investigator to clarify, supplement or explain the information provided in the proposal and to set the deadline by which this should be done. If the principal investigator fails to submit the information on time or submits incomplete information, the administrative check of the proposal will be carried out on the basis of the information submitted.

25. The project assignment to the group of proposals (for a competition, task, measure etc.), project justification, description of activities and cost estimate amendments are not allowed.

26. The results of the administrative check shall be recorded in the statement using a form approved by the Chairman of the Council and by the order of the Chairman of the Council.

27. The results of the administrative check of the proposal submitted to the Council will be communicated to the principal investigator to the email address indicated in the proposal.

28. The Council submits the results of the administrative check of the proposals submitted under the call of the international programme to the institution administering the call of the international programme.

29. Only the proposals that meet the requirements of the administrative check shall be submitted for the expert evaluation.

30. An expert evaluation of the proposals submitted to the Council shall be carried out by expert commissions which shall be set up and organise their work according to the general rules of experts'

activities approved by the Chairman of the Council and a description of the procedure for the expert evaluation and/or the provisions of the relevant international programme. The description of the procedure for the performance of an expert evaluation shall be applied to the extent that it does not contradict with the provisions of the relevant international programme.

31. Following the expert evaluation of proposals submitted to the Council:

31.1. if an expert evaluation was carried out by an expert commission set up by the Committee on Humanities and Social Sciences or the Committee on Natural and Technical Sciences (hereinafter referred to as the Committee):

31.1.1. The Committee, having assessed the list of proposals eligible for funding provided by the expert commission (the list of projects recommended for funding submitted by the implementation group), the evaluation results of the other institution administering the call of the other international programme, and the available funds, shall submit a proposal to the Chairman of the Council or the bilateral (tripartite) committee, bilateral commission or other institution administering the call of the international programme on the projects selected for funding, indicating the amount allocated for the implementation of each project. The Committee may submit a proposal regarding the list of projects potentially selected for funding (hereinafter referred to as reserve), taking into account also the proposal of implementation group on reserve projects, in which reserve projects are arranged in order of priority;

31.1.2. After assessing the proposal(s) drawn up by the Committee and/or the decision taken in accordance with the rules of the international programme, the Chairman of the Council approves the results of the call for proposals: the list of the projects selected for funding, the list of non-funded projects and, if necessary, the list of reserve projects. Before approving the list of projects selected for funding, the Chairman of the Council may, in exceptional cases, return it to the Committee requesting the Committee to revise the amount of funds proposed to be allocated for the projects.

31.2. If the expert evaluation was carried out by an expert commission set up by the Chairman of the Council, the Chairman of the Council, after assessing the list of proposals selected for funding provided by the expert commission, the results of the evaluation of the institution administering the call of the other international programme and/or the decision taken in accordance with the rules of the international programme and having regard to the funds available, shall approve the results of the call for proposals: the list of the projects selected for funding, the list of non-funded projects and, if necessary, a list of reserve projects arranged in order of priority.

32. An expert evaluation of the proposals submitted to the institution administering the call of the international programme shall be organised by the institution administering the call of the international programme in accordance with the evaluation criteria and procedure established by the relevant international programme. The Committee has the right to perform an evaluation of budget eligibility of the proposals submitted to the institution administering the call of the international programme during an administrative check or after the expert evaluation.

33. If the expert evaluation is organised by the institution administering the call of the international programme, the Chairman of the Council, having assessed the decision taken in accordance with the rules of the international programme and having regard to the funds available, and taking into account the evaluation provided by the Committee in Clause 32 of the Rules, shall approve the results of the call for proposals: the list of projects selected for funding, lists of non-funded projects, and, if necessary, a list of reserve projects arranged in order of priority.

34. The decision of the Chairman of the Council regarding the results of the evaluation of the proposal shall be communicated to the principal investigator to the email address indicated in the proposal.

35. Projects included into the reserve list may be funded whenever it becomes possible. The decision to fund the project(s) from the list of reserve projects is taken by the Chairman of the Council on his own initiative or on the basis of the proposal of the Committee, the institution administering the call of the international programme, the bilateral (tripartite) committee, or bilateral commission, indicating the amount allocated to each project.

36. The reserve shall be valid until the deadline of the term stipulated upon approval of the reserve. The implementers of the projects included in the list of reserve projects may take part in other competitions announced by the Council.

37. The Council shall publish all data on proposals obtained (indicating the call, the proposal registration number, the implementing institution and project partners, the scientific field and area, and the funds being asked for the implementation of the project) and the list of projects selected for funding (indicating the call, the proposal registration or grant agreement number, the primary investigator, the implementing institution and project partners, the project name and annotation, the scientific field and area of the project, the project implementation period, and the funds allocated to the project) as well as the list of reserve projects (indicating the proposal registration number, the implementing institution).

CHAPTER IV APPEAL SUBMISSION AND EXAMINATION PROCEDURE

38. An appeal may be lodged by the appellant no later than within three working days following the notification of the decision of the Chairman of the Council regarding the administrative check of the proposal or the expert evaluation of the proposal or report.

39. An appeal shall be examined if the appellant can justify one of the following circumstances:

39.1. factual errors that could have a decisive influence on the evaluation of the proposal or the report have been made during the administrative check or expert evaluation;

39.2. procedural non-conformities that could have a decisive influence on the evaluation of the proposal or the report have been made during the administrative check or expert evaluation;

40. Disagreement with the result of the expert evaluation (score) or the scientific conclusion of the expert (interpretation) does not provide grounds for appeal from the appellant.

41. The appeal must indicate the decision appealed, the date of the decision, the grounds for the appeal, the documents proving it and the appellant's request.

42. The Research Foundation shall verify the compliance of the appeal to the requirements specified in Clauses 2.2, 38 and 41 and inform the appellant, whether the appeal will be submitted for examination to the Council's Board of Appeal for Competitive Funding (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board of Appeal') no later than within three working days from the day of receipt of the appeal at the Council. In the event where the appeal does not comply with the specified requirements, the appellant shall be notified within the aforementioned period stating the reasons for incompliance and the fact that the appeal will not be presented to the Board of Appeal for examination.

43. Appeals, which comply with the applicable requirements, shall be examined by the Board of Appeal consisting of 7 expert members, who meet the requirements applicable to experts of the Council and who have signed the Pledge of the Expert of the Council, pursuant to the general rules of experts' activities approved by the Chairman of the Council. Members of the Board and Committees of the Council, as well as staff members of the Research Foundation cannot be appointed as members of the Board of Appeal. The composition of the Board of Appeal shall be approved by the Chairman of the Council as proposed by the Board of the Council from candidates selected from the Committees. The Chairman of the Council shall also appoint the chairman and deputy chairman of the Board of Appeal. Composition of the Board of Appeal shall be renewed on an annual basis, where 3 members are replaced one year and 4 members are replaced the following year. A meeting of the Board of Appeal shall be deemed valid if at least half of the members are present. Decisions of the Board of Appeal shall be adopted by a simple majority of votes. In the event where the votes are tied, the Chairman of the Board of Appeal shall have a casting vote. The work of the Board of Appeal shall be organised pursuant to the procedure laid down by the Rules of Procedure for the Board of Appeal approved by the Chairman of the Council.

44. The Board of Appeal shall examine the appeal no later than within ten working days following the day of receipt of the appeal by adopting one of the following reasoned decisions:

44.1. to uphold the appeal (indicating, whether the appeal is upheld fully or partly);

44.2. to refuse the appeal.

45. Having evaluated the reasoned decision to uphold the appeal adopted by the Board of Appeal the Chairman of the Council may instruct:

45.1. the Research Foundation to perform administrative re-check of the application (if the appeal was lodged with regard to factual errors or procedural non-conformities committed during the administrative check) and to submit an updated statement on the administrative check of the application for approval of results of the administrative check;

45.2. the expert commission, which has carried out the evaluation of the application, to perform expert re-evaluation of the application (if the appeal was lodged with regard to factual errors or procedural non-conformities committed during the expert evaluation) and to submit an updated final summary evaluation and, where appropriate, to revise the priority list of projects selected for funding. Work of the expert commission shall be organised in such way that the application was individually evaluated by those members of the commission who have not yet performed the individual evaluation of the said application. Additional expert(s) may be appointed;

45.3. the expert commission (individual experts), which performed the evaluation of the report, to perform expert re-evaluation thereof (if the appeal was lodged with regard to factual errors or procedural non-conformities committed during the expert evaluation) and to submit an updated final summary evaluation. Work of the expert commission shall be organised in such way that the report was individually evaluated by those members of the commission who have not yet performed the individual evaluation of the said report. Additional expert(s) may be appointed. If the report was evaluated by individual expert(s), the Committee, which has appointed the said expert(s), shall appoint a different individual expert. Expert evaluation of the newly appointed expert shall be submitted to the Committee based on its area of expertise.

46. After the actions specified in Clauses 45.1-45.3 of the Rules are carried out, the Chairman of the Council may amend their previous decision, adopted on basis of the expert evaluation of the administrative check, application or report.

47. The appellant shall be notified in writing of the decision on their appeal no later than three working days following the date of the respective decision of the Chairman of the Council.

47¹. Appeals regarding the administrative check or expert evaluation of applications or reports of international programmes shall be lodged pursuant to the rules of international programmes.

CHAPTER V PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

SECTION 1 SIGNING THE GRANT AGREEMENT

48. After the Chairman of the Council approves the results of the call for proposals and in absence of appeals within the period specified in Clause 38 of the Rules, a tripartite grant agreement in the form approved by the Chairman of the Council (hereinafter referred to as the grant agreement) shall be signed with respect of each project included in the list of projects selected for funding. The parties to the agreement are the Council, the implementing institution and the principal investigator.

49. In the case of the appeals received within the time period specified in Clause 38 of the Rules, the signing of agreements is commenced only after the decision of the Board of Appeal has been taken on appeals and, if necessary, after the Chairman of the Council has changed the decision on the approval of the results of the call for proposals.

50. Before the conclusion of the grant agreement, the proposal may be adjusted according to suggestions made during the expert evaluation and the selection process. The principal investigator

and the implementing institution may coordinate with the Council the proposed changes in the estimate of the project costs and related changes in the intended activities of the project. The total amount allocated to the project may not be increased. If the Council does not approve the changes in question or if the principal investigator fails to amend the proposals according to the suggestions of the Council (if any), the agreement may not be signed.

51. The grant agreement shall be signed within 10 working days from the date of dispatch of the draft grant agreement. The principal investigator and the implementing institution may once request the term for the signing of the grant agreement to be postponed. Failure to sign the grant agreement within the prescribed period of time without any request to postpone the term of the grant agreement signing shall be considered as a withdrawal to sign the grant agreement by the other parties.

SECTION 2 SCIENTIFIC SUPERVISION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

52. The principal investigator and implementing institution shall submit to the Council a scientific (annual or interim and final) or dissemination (final) project reports. The type of report to be submitted shall be indicated in the proposal and/or the grant agreement.

53. The annual scientific report shall be submitted after the first (and the second if the project is implemented for longer than 24 months) year of the project implementation. The interim scientific report shall be submitted in the middle of the project implementation period. An interim scientific report shall not be submitted if the project is implemented for a period shorter than 18 months. The final scientific (dissemination) report shall be submitted upon the completion of the project.

54. The scientific (dissemination) report shall be submitted within the terms and according to the procedure specified in the grant agreement by completing the report form approved by the Chairman of the Council. A letter of the implementing institution in the form approved by the Chairman of the Council shall be submitted together with it.

55. An expert evaluation of the scientific (dissemination) reports submitted to the Council shall be carried out by expert commissions (or individual experts) which are set up and organise their work according to the general rules of experts' activities approved by the Chairman of the Council and a description of the procedure of expert evaluation. The description of the procedure for the performance of an expert evaluation shall be applied to the extent that it does not contradict with the provisions of the relevant international programme.

56. Following the expert evaluation of reports:

56.1. if the expert evaluation was carried out by an expert commission (individual experts) set up (appointed) by the Committee:

56.1.1. Having assessed the conclusions (proposals of the implementation group) of the expert commission (individual experts), the Committee shall draw up a proposal to the Chairman of the Council on the results of the expert evaluation of the scientific (dissemination) reports;

56.1.2. Taking into account the proposal submitted by the Committee, the Chairman of the Council approves the results of the expert evaluation of the scientific (dissemination) reports;

56.1.3. If so provided, following the expert evaluation of the reports of the international programme, the Committee, having regard to the conclusions of the expert commission (individual experts), shall submit a proposal to the bilateral (tripartite) committee or the bilateral commission for the approval of the reports.

56.2. if the expert evaluation was carried out by an expert commission (individual experts) set up by the Chairman of the Council:

56.2.1. Having regard to the recommendation drawn up by the expert commission (individual experts), the Chairman of the Council approves the results of the expert evaluation of the scientific (dissemination) reports;

56.2.2. Following the expert evaluation of the reports of the international programme, if so provided, the Chairman of the Council, having regard to the conclusions of the expert commission

(individual experts), shall submit a proposal to the bilateral (tripartite) committee or the bilateral commission for the approval of the reports.

57. When approving the proposals as set out in Clause 56 of the Rules, additional period of time with a duration of three years from the end of project implementation indicated in the grant agreement may be given for the submission of results (output) which were planned within the scope of the project but not delivered together with its final scientific (dissemination) report (hereinafter referred to as the planned output). The principal investigator of such a project may submit the planned output on the Council's electronic system in any time prior to the end of the additional period of time.

58. If necessary, the Committee (implementation group) and the Chairman of the Council may invite the principal investigator to present a scientific (dissemination) report or to explain it.

59. Taking into account to the evaluation of the project's annual or interim scientific report, the Chairman of the Council may adopt the decision to reduce the funds allocated for the implementation of the project or refuse to allocate funds for the next project implementation period (terminate).

60. The Council shall publish summaries of the main results of the implemented projects contained in the final scientific (dissemination) reports together with the amount of fund used for the implementation of the project and the information set out in Clause 37 of the Rules.

SECTION 3 FINANCIAL SUPERVISION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

61. The funds allocated for the implementation of the project shall be used according to a project cost estimate specifying direct cost types and indirect (if any) costs.

62. The implementing institution and the principal investigator shall submit to the Council (quarterly and annual) financial reports of the project.

63. The financial reports (quarterly and annual reports on the use of funds) shall be submitted in accordance with the forms approved by the Chairman of the Council within the terms specified in the agreement.

64. Project financial reports shall be evaluated by the Research Foundation. The Council may request additional information related to the data contained in the reports, request clarification or an explanation of the use of funds or changes to the cost estimate of the project, or refuse to recognise the costs incurred as eligible.

65. Funds shall only be transferred to the project each quarter if the report on the use of funds of the previous quarter has been evaluated positively. Having regard to the evaluation of the quarterly or annual report on the use of funds, the Council may reduce the funds allocated for the implementation of the project.

66. The implementing institution shall use the indirect costs of all the research and dissemination projects funded by the Council in that year in line with the ratio set by the Chairman of the Council for indirect costs, in terms of different indirect cost groups.

SECTION 4 AMENDING THE GRANT AGREEMENT

67. During the implementation of the project, the parties to the grant agreement may initiate motivated amendments of the grant agreement (annexes thereto) related to the project cost estimate, project implementers, project activities etc.

68. The following amendments are not permitted:

68.1. changing the amount of funds provided in the project cost estimate for the previous quarters;

68.2. increasing indirect costs.

69. The decision regarding the permission to make amendments that relate to changes of parties to the grant agreement, terms for submitting scientific (dissemination) reports or project output

(results), are adopted by the Committee.

70. The Council's provisions on other amendments of the grant agreement are specified in the agreement.

71. Changes made during the project implementation reporting period and amendments to the agreement shall be indicated and explained in the annual or interim and final scientific (dissemination) and financial reports.

CHAPTER VI RESTRICTIONS WITH REGARDS TO THE FAILURE TO FULFIL CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

72. If decisions of the Ombudsperson that came into force or court decisions in regards to the decisions of the Ombudsperson that were adopted and came into force determine that a person has violated the academic ethics and the violation involves the most severe forms of conduct that are not in line with the principles of the academic ethics and are indicated in Recommendations Clause 17, applications for which that person is designated as the principal investigator or other primary project implementer shall not be considered for any of the areas of activities supported by the Council for a period of five years from the date when the decision came into force.

73. If the Chairman of the Council decides to terminate the project or declares the project unimplemented when approving the proposals referred to in Clause 56 of the Rules, proposals for the projects for all the areas of activities supported by the Council, where the scientist who managed a terminated or an unimplemented project is indicated as the principal investigator of future projects, shall not be considered for three years from the date of the decision.

74. If the Chairman of the Council decides to allocate an additional period of time for the submission of the planned output, proposals of the principal investigator, where he/she is indicated as a principal investigator of future projects, shall not be considered in any of the areas of activities supported by the Council until the missing planned output from the previous project is submitted to the Council and evaluated, providing for evaluation no more than three calendar month.

75. If after ending of the additional period of time given for the submission of planned output the Chairman of the Council takes a decision to declare the project unimplemented, proposals for the projects for all the areas of activities supported by the Council, where the scientist who managed an unimplemented project is indicated as the principal investigator of future projects, shall not be considered for two years from the date of the decision.

CHAPTER VII FINAL PROVISIONS

76. The Council may conduct on-the-spot checks of projects aiming to verify compliance with the legislation adopted by the Council, to ascertain whether the implementing institution and the principal investigator are fulfilling their contractual obligations and rationally using the funds, or whether the information related to the implementation of the project is in line with the one submitted to the Council. Such checks shall be organised and performed in accordance with the provisions of the Description of the Procedure for Assessing the Appropriateness of the Use of Funds approved by the Chairman of the Council. The Council has the right to terminate the grant agreement if significant irregularities (shortcomings) are established during the course of the check.

77. The implementing institution, in accordance with the provisions of the Law on Research and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania, publicly announces the results of the project-based research and experimental development, to the extent allowed by legal acts governing intellectual property, and commercial or state and institutional secrets.

78. In accordance with the Guidelines for Open Access to Scientific Publications and Data approved by the Council, the principal investigator and the implementing institution shall strive to

ensure that data obtained during the implementation of the project, and the results of research and experimental development are properly used and stored in such a way as to ensure access to them.

79. The Council does not claim the ownership of the property rights to the results of the intellectual activities carried out within the projects funded by the Council.

80. Information, which became known to the members of the Council, civil servants and employees on basis of the present Rules, shall be handled pursuant to the provisions of the Description of the Procedure of Identification and Use of Confidential Information approved by the Chairman of the Council.

81. Decisions of the Chairman of the Council adopted on the basis of the administrative check or expert evaluation of the application or report, may be appealed pursuant to the procedure specified in the Chapter IV of the Rules or pursuant to the procedure laid down by the Article 29 of the Law on Administrative Proceedings.
