**Criteria for evaluation of quality of final results of refinanced project under subprogramme “ERA Chairs" of the program “Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation”**

(Guidelines for experts selected from the European Commission’s database for evaluation of projects of Measure 1.1.1.5.)

**1. EXCELLENCE**

*Evaluate information of final report (Section 1 “Project Progress Description” and Section 2 “Excellence”) and other sections of final report as well as correspondence to Proposal Section 1 “Excellence” and expert recommendations of mid-term evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) whether implementation of the project is aimed at achieving of objectives and results planned in the application?

2) whether the implemented activities at the end of the project will ensure structural changes and sustainable excellence of the institution?

3) whether the beneficiary has used an appropriate methodology, approaches and activities to achieve the goal and final results of the project?

3) how does the initial project goal and activities correspond to the actual results?

4) to what extent has this project raised field of research to a higher level?

5) to what extent has this project promoted institution of beneficiary to a higher level?

6) whether the research activities involve the development of novel methodology?

7) whether the scientific quality of the achieved research/ innovation results[[1]](#endnote-2) is appropriate, considering the scientific value of the achieved results, the level of novelty, interdisciplinarity:

(a) the activities carried out and the results achieved are scientifically sound and innovative.

(b) the information contained in the scientific articles developed and published within the project corresponds to the purpose and content of the project.

(c) technology developed within the project implementation complies with the definition of new technology[[2]](#endnote-3) (if applicable).

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Corresponds |  |
| Partly corresponds |  |
| Disagrees |  |

**2. IMPACT**

*Evaluate the information in Section 3 “Impact” and other sections of the final report as well as correspondence to Proposal (Section 2 “Impact”) and expert recommendations of mid-term evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) whether project activities and results achieved at the end proves project direction toward:

a) institutional changes within the ERA Chair host institution allowing for its full participation in the European Research Area.

b) improvements in attractiveness of the institution for internationally excellent and mobile researchers (including a policy of compliance to the European Research Area priorities like (an open recruitment policy, gender balance, peer review and innovative doctoral training).

c) research excellence of the institution in the specific fields covered by the ERA Chair holders (as well as whether project activities, results and indicators achieved at the end illustrate quantitatively and qualitatively progress toward to research excellence).

d) improvements of capability to compete successfully in internationally competitive research funding.

2) whether results achieved in project ensure transformation of national economy and implementation of priorities set by RIS3 or the development of areas of smart specialization?

3) whether dissemination and transfer of research results have positive impact on the needs of beneficiary institution, economic development, and society?

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Corresponds |  |
| Partly corresponds |  |
| Disagrees |  |

**3. QUALITY OF IMPLEMENTATION**

*Evaluate the information in section 4 “Quality of implementation” and other sections of the final report”, including the appendix “Summary of the Project Budget” and expert recommendations of mid-term evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) the conformity of financial resources used for the implementation of the project activities with the amount of work accomplished and the results achieved whether the infrastructure and other material costs where necessary and reasonable (if applicable);

2) efficiency of the project activities (activities, work packages), tasks, deliverables and milestones, and compliance with project proposal “Proposal” and the time chart (Gantt chart).

3) the adequacy of the resource and results management system for the purpose (s) of the project, including quality and risk management;

4) quality of cooperation of scientific staff and contribution to the achievement of the project objectives.

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Corresponds |  |
| Partly corresponds |  |
| Disagrees |  |

***Evaluation procedure for scientific quality***

1. The evaluation of the scientific quality of the results achieved consists of two stages:

1) the initial individual assessment of each expert made according to the evaluation criteria;

2) formulation and approval of the consolidated opinion of the expert group.

2. In the initial individual assessment, the expert assesses the evaluation form in each of the evaluation criteria (i.e. Scientific Excellence, Socio-Economic Impact, Quality of Implementation), indicating its relevance to the specific criterion “C*orresponds / Partly corresponds / Disagrees*”; reasonably argue its assessment. If an expert's assessment of one of the criteria is “*Partly corresponds / Disagrees*”, the expert evaluates the justification of the non-achievement, assesses the extent to which the aims are achieved and indicates the degree of achievement of the research results and results achieved in the project against the planned (in percentage terms).

3. In order to develop a consolidated assessment, including a unified view of the degree of achievement of the project results at the originally planned (in percentage) of the project, the experts will agree on the consolidated view, which includes evaluation of results achieved and recommendations for the scientific quality and implementation process of the project (if necessary).

4. Consolidated assessment includes assessment, argumented reasoning in each of the assessment criteria, as well as assessment of the extent to which the aims are achieved (if applicable). In the reasoning section, each of the evaluation criteria should indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the project's progress.

5. If experts agree that there is a fundamental disagreement between them and it is not possible to achieve a consolidated assessment of the project, the experts shall inform the Central Finance and Contracting Agency (hereinafter - CFCA) thereof and discontinue the evaluation of the project.

In such a case, the CFCA invites the third expert - a dispute solver. The third expert is introduced to all previously prepared evaluation documentation of the scientific quality of the project, including the draft consolidated assessment, which has not been agreed upon by the two previous experts. The third expert prepares a new consolidated view. The evaluation of each of the criteria in this opinion may not exceed the lowest or highest rating given in the individual assessments. For each criterion, the arguments of all three experts should be summarized.

6. The anonymous evaluation of experts, without the names of experts, shall be available to the beneficiary (host institution) and the researcher.

In the overall evaluation that incorporates evaluation of the level of achievement of the project aim and the planned results the expert shall fill-in an additional column providing the proportional level of criteria performance, thus evaluating the scope of achievement of the project aim and the planned results in terms of per cents. The overall proportional evaluation of the criteria performance and achievement coefficient is provided on basis of the following methodology:

*“****Corresponds****”: total proportional evaluation of criteria is 85% - 100% and more. Score within the said range is granted if the project has reached or exceeded the initially planned and the total performance is evaluated as satisfactory, and if a total non-execution of one or several evaluation criteria has been stated it has not substantially affected the overall achievement of the project aim and the planned results. If during mid-term scientific quality evaluation any suggestions for further project development have been proposed, they have been fully complied with or a reasoned justification for non-compliance with such recommendations has been submitted;*

*“****Partly corresponds****”: total proportional evaluation of criteria is 25% - 84%. Score within the said range is granted if the project has partly reached the initially planned; moreover, a total non-execution of one or several evaluation criteria has been stated and it has substantially affected the overall achievement of the project aim and the planned results. If during mid-term scientific quality evaluation any suggestions for further project development have been proposed, they have been partly complied with or have not been taken into consideration, and the justification for non-compliance with such recommendations was not reasoned enough;*

*“****Disagrees****”: total proportional evaluation of criteria is 0% - 24%. Score within the said range is granted if the project has not almost entirely or entirely reached the initially planned. Almost total or total non-execution of one or several evaluation criteria has been stated and it can be concluded that the overall project aim and planned results have not been reached or have been reached poorly. If during mid-term scientific quality evaluation any suggestions for further project development have been proposed, they have not been taken into consideration, and a reasoned justification for non-compliance with such recommendations has not been submitted.*

Drawing up of a consolidated evaluation of the EC experts – both EC experts are contracted to cooperate in order to draw up a single (consolidated) evaluation. The final evaluation of the level of achievement of the project aim and the planned results (performance coefficient) shall be based on the single expert evaluation in terms of per cents. This final evaluation is used when deciding on achievement of the project aim and the planned results and, when necessary, on application of guidelines of the Ministry of Finance No.2.7 “Guidelines to Financial Corrections, Reporting on Non-Compliances Stated in Implementation of the European Union Funds, Recovery of Improper Expenses during the Planning Period 2014–2020”.

**Calculation of the amount of financial corrections in case of partial achievement of the project aim or the final indicators (in accordance with provisions of the laws and regulations on implementation of the respective Specific Support Objective)[[3]](#footnote-2)**

If the implementation coefficient does not exceed:

1. 65%, but is not lower than 60% - the single rate of 5% shall be applied;
2. 60%, but is not lower than 50% - the single rate of 10% shall be applied;
3. 50% - the single rate of 25% shall be applied.

If it is possible to clearly determine/separate expenses related to non-achievement of the project aim or the final indicators, it shall be clearly documented, and a correction can be applied also to the said expenses related to the particular breach, and not to the total expenses related to the project.

1. See description results and indicators in Section 1 “Project Progress Description” of the final report. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. A new technology – technology, that meets the requirements of Commission Regulation (EU) No 172/2014 of 17 June 2014 On the definition of certain categories of aid as compatible with the internal market pursuant to Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty (Official Journal of the European Union, 26 June 2014, No L 187), as defined in Article 2 (114), i.e. is a new and unproven technology compared to the technical level achieved in the industry, which is associated with the risk of technological or industrial failure and is not the optimization or improvement of existing technology. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. In accordance with the EC approach in case of non-achievement of the performance framework indicators (the EC Guidance for Member States on Performance framework, review and reserve http://www.esfondi.lv/vadlinijas--skaidrojumi) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)