**Evaluation criteria for experts from European Commission’s database for evaluation of the achieved scientific quality within the Maria Sklodovska-Curie scholarship’s subprogram “Individual Scholarships (IS)”**

**SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE**

*Evaluate the information in the section 2 “Scientific excellence” and other sections of report as well as correspondence to the planned progress as per project proposal annex “Research Proposal” Part B, Chapter 1 “Excellence”, the Gantt chart and expert recommendations of mid-term scientific quality evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) whether the of objectives and results planned in the application at the end of the project have been fully achieved. If the aim of the project and the planned research results are not fully achieved, evaluation of the justification of the non-achievement shall be provided and evaluation of the extent to which the aims are achieved shall be provided;

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

(a) the activities carried 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 (if applicable);

(c) the product or technology developed within the project implementation complies with the definition of a new product[[2]](#endnote-2) or new technology[[3]](#endnote-3) (if applicable). Compliance with the definition of a new product or technology should be assessed in the light of:

- comparison of the market and parameters of the products or technologies in the market and the target market and parameters of the developed prototype within the project: functional characteristics, use, technical specification, components, materials, software, cost price;

- the commercialization potential of the new product / technology prototype developed within the project, characterized by the level of technological readiness (TRL) and the degree of innovation;

3) whether appropriateness of the training and the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the receiving institution, including quality in integration team/institution, as well as researcher’s scientific group leader’s involvement, is provided according to originally planned.

4) Researcher's professional growth and achieved independence during the project.

**Expert evaluation:**

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

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT**

*Evaluate the information in Section 3 “Socio-economic Impact” and other sections of the report as well as correspondence to the planned progress as per project proposal annex “Research Proposal” Part B, Chapter 2 “Impact”, the Gantt chart and expert recommendations of mid-term scientific quality evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) the social and economic impact of the research results achieved, including the implementation of the economic transformation directions, priorities or smart specialization areas defined in RIS3;

2) the impact of the dissemination and transfer of research results (including knowledge and technology transfer) on the needs of the researcher, host institution, economic development and society, including the quality of the proposed activities to inform different target groups about the project activities;

3) the impact of the research results achieved on the future career prospects of the researcher and the increase in scientific capacity, including the development of scientific careers;

(4) contribution of past project activities to the promotion of international scientific cooperation between the institution and the researcher (for example, how the project develops knowledge and innovation through the development of new project applications, developing new networks, developing publications, engaging with international consortia, etc.).

**Expert evaluation:**

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

**QUALITY OF IMPLEMENTATION**

*Evaluate the information in section 4 “Quality of implementation” and other sections of the report, including the appendix “Project Budget Summary”, as well as correspondence to the planned progress as per project proposal “Research Proposal” Part B, Chapter 3 “Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation”, the Gantt chart and expert recommendations of mid-term scientific quality evaluation (if applicable).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) the conformity of the material (including research infrastructure, materials) and financial resources used for the implementation of the project activities with the amount of work accomplished and the results achieved;

2) Efficiency of the project activities (activities, work packages), tasks, deliverables and milestones, and compliance with the planned project proposal “Research Proposal” Part B 3 and the time chart (Gantt chart). The expert will evaluate, inter alia, whether the remaining research results can be achieved during the remaining project implementation period;

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

4) the compliance of the training activities implemented by the researcher with the set objectives and the research topic;

5) quality of cooperation - distribution of the functions and responsibilities of the partners, contribution to the objectives of the research application (if applicable).

**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)[[4]](#footnote-1)**

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. The specific output indicators to be achieved within the project are given in Table 1.6.1 of the report and are as follows:

(a) original scientific articles published in journals or collections of conference articles whose quotation index reaches at least 50 percent of the industry's average citation index;

(b) original scientific articles published in journals or conference proceedings included in the Web of Science or SCOPUS (A or B) databases;

(c) "technology rights" means patents or other intangible assets;

(d) intellectual property license agreements;

e) prototype of a new product or new technology;

(f) new treatment and diagnostic methods (including non-commercial method);

(g) other results of the project specific to the specificity of the study (including data) complementing the research results referred to in points (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of this criterion, including the results specified in the Research proposal Part B Chapter 2 “Impact” if not included in the results above. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. A new product: a new product has been developed (goods or services that are brand new or have advanced functional features, or change the expected use (including changed or improved technical parameters, components, materials, added software, user-friendly features)) to provide knowledge and technology transfer (i.e. providing certain knowledge, production skills and technology from the developer to the user for production or use purposes) or project development in production or service delivery.

The following shall not be considered a new product:

• stopping the use of part of a process;

• replacement of capital or extensive extensions (purchase of modules identical to those used, minor extensions, upgrades of equipment and software). New equipment or extensions must have substantial improvements to the specification;

• changes in component prices due to changes in product prices (product price or production process productivity changes are not considered product innovations, such as computer production, reduced chip price, reduced sales prices for the same computer model);

• customization of products to specific needs (e.g. customization of the product to the customer's needs, which does not lead to changes in the functional or technical characteristics of the new product which ensure a higher competitiveness of the new product compared to the existing products);

• daily, seasonal and cyclical changes and improvements (for example, in the clothing manufacturing, a new seasonal collection is not considered to be an innovation);

• design changes (including taste and smell) that do not change function, use or technical characteristics;

• resale of other manufacturers' goods or processes;

• improvements in marketing (including aesthetic changes);

• improvement of organizational processes in the operation of the merchant. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. 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)
4. 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-1)