Extract from Annex 1 to the Regulations of awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects, set forth in NCN Council Resolution No 26/2019 of 14 March 2019

Proposal assessment criteria in the OPUS call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[1]

- yes
- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[1]

- yes
- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criterion of basic research**[2]**?**[1]

- yes
- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the other requirements of the call announcement?**[1]

- yes
- no

if no, please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT 55%

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED 40%

5 Outstanding, project results may be published in top scientific papers/magazines.

4 Very good, project results may be published in core scientific papers/magazines of the area.

3 Good, project results may be published in specialist international papers/magazines.

2 Average, project results may be published in papers/magazines with little scientific significance.

1 Poor.

0 Very poor.

Justification:

[1] This question applies to stage I of merit-based evaluation.

[2] Pursuant to Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, basic research shall mean experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular commercial application or use in view.

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE INNOVATIVE NATURE OF THE PROJECT AND IMPACT OF THE PROJECT ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE 15%

- **project nature**:

3 Innovative project.

1 Project with innovative elements.

0 Project without innovative elements.

- **the impact of the research project on development of the academic discipline:**

3 Project with major impact on development of the academic discipline.

1 Project with moderate impact on development of the academic discipline.

0 Project without impact on development of the academic discipline/submitted to a wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR 40%

- **research achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned scientific papers/ magazines:**

5 Outstanding, the principal investigator is among world leaders in his/her area.

4 Very good, the principal investigator is an internationally renowned expert in his/her area.

3 Good, the principal investigator is internationally recognised in his/her area.

2 Average, the principal investigator is domestically recognised in his/her area.

1 Poor, no recognition in the area.

0 No research achievements.

- **assessment of performance by the principal investigator of other projects that were funded from the budget for science. If the principal investigator has not managed projects so far, transfer the assessment from the above item:**

5 Effects of completed projects published in top scientific papers/magazines.

4 Effects of completed projects published in core scientific papers/magazines of the area.

3 Effects of completed projects published in specialist international papers/magazines.

2 Effects of completed projects published in specialist papers/magazines.

1 Effects of completed projects published in papers/magazines of little scientific significance.

0 Projects completed without the results being published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY 5%

- **assessment of project feasibility, including competencies of the principal investigator, structure of the research team, research facilities, etc.:**

3 Very good.

2 Good.

1 Poor.

0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regards to the subject and scope of the research?**[1]

- yes
- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet the admissibility criteria to future OPUS, PRELUDIUM calls?**[3]

- yes
- no

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

This document is not a certified translation and has been prepared for your convenience. In the case of any doubts as to the interpretation of its provisions, the Polish version shall prevail.

[3] To be agreed by the Expert Team at stage I of merit-based evaluation.