NARODOWE CENTRUM NAUKI

Annex to NCN Council Resolution No 61/2020 of 21 May 2020 amending the Regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects

REGULATIONS ON AWARDING FUNDING FOR RESEARCH TASKS FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTRE AS REGARDS RESEARCH PROJECTS

Table of contents:

Chapter I
General Provisions

§1. Acting pursuant to Article 21 of the NCN Act, the Council sets forth the Regulations on awarding funding for research funded by the NCN in the OPUS, PRELUDIUM, PRELUDIUM BIS, SONATINA, SONATA, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls, subject to the transparency principles of call procedures and expert selection procedures.

§2. The principles for awarding funding by the NCN for tasks other than specified in §1shall be subject to separate regulations.

§3. Whenever the Regulations refer to:

1) NCN, it shall mean the National Science Centre;
2) NCN Act, it shall mean the Act on the National Science Centre of 30 April 2010 (uniform text in Journal of Laws of 2019, item 1384);
3) Director, it shall mean the Director of the National Science Centre;
4) Council, it shall mean the Council of the National Science Centre;
5) Scientific Coordinator, it shall mean the Scientific Coordinator within the meaning of Article 2 (5) of the NCN Act;
6) research, it shall mean research within the meaning of Article 4 (2) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018 (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1668, as amended);
7) basic research, it shall mean basic research within the meaning of Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018;
8) disciplines or groups of disciplines, they shall mean NCN panels determined by the NCN's Council, covering research in three scientific areas: Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (HS), Physical Sciences and Engineering (ST) and Life Sciences (NZ), within which NCN announces and holds calls for proposals;
9) auxiliary review panels, they shall mean review panels specifying disciplines covered by a specific NCN review panel;
10) projects, they shall mean research projects within the meaning of Article 2 (2) of the NCN Act, funded under NCN calls;
11) proposal, it shall mean a proposal for funding of a project submitted under NCN calls;
12) ZSUN/OSF, it shall mean an electronic submission system (Integrated System of Services for Science/Servicing Financing Streams);
13) call edition, it shall mean NCN calls in which proposals are submitted by the same date.

Chapter II
Expert selection principles

§4. Pursuant to Article 18 (7) of the NCN Act, the Council shall select members of the Expert Team responsible for evaluating proposals submitted in the calls. In its selection, the Council shall follow the following principles:

1) candidates shall be selected among outstanding Polish and foreign researchers, holding a minimum of a PhD degree, including former winners of NCN calls, considering their research achievements and experience in assessment of research projects in Poland and abroad and experience in performance of research projects funded under calls in Poland and abroad;

2) an important element of the assessment covers information available from bibliometric sources for tracking researchers' achievements, subject to the specific nature of respective research domains and information from available lists of recipients of funds granted in the calls for research projects conducted in Poland and abroad.

§5. The detailed criteria and procedure for selecting the Expert Teams shall be set forth by the Council in the following document: "Expert Teams of the National Science Centre – Establishing and Appointing".

Chapter III
Restrictions to submission of proposals in NCN calls

§6. A person named as the principal investigator in the proposal must not be named as the authorised representative of the host institution.

§7. In a specific edition of calls, the same person may be named as the principal investigator in one proposal only.

§8. A person named as the principal investigator in a proposal must not be a person who, on the last day of submitting NCN proposals:

a) manages[1] three or more projects financed under NCN calls;
b) manages two projects financed under NCN calls and is named as the principal investigator in a proposal under evaluation or recommended for funding;
c) manages a research project financed under NCN calls and is named as the principal investigator in two proposals under evaluation or recommended for funding;
d) is named as the principal investigator in three proposals under evaluation or recommended for funding under NCN calls.

The limitations do not apply to proposals submitted or projects funded under the following calls:

- TANGO, DIOSCURI;
- EXPRESS CALL TO FUND RESEARCH INTO COVID-19;
- CEUS-UNISONO, in the case of which a joint proposal submitted to the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) as the lead agency of the *Stand-Alone Projects* programme is devoted to crises like epidemics or pandemics covered by the fast review track (*FWF Urgent Funding for Research Into Humanitarian Crises like Epidemics and Pandemics*); and
- ALPHORN–COVID-19

§9. A person named as the principal investigator in a proposal must not be planned for a research activity in any proposal which has been submitted to the MINIATURA call and for which the funding decision has not become final.

§10. The principal investigator must be a person employed at the host institution for the project for the entire project duration period pursuant to at least a part-time employment contract. It does not apply to the PRELUDIUM BIS and PRELUDIUM calls.

§11. The principal investigator must reside in Poland for at least 50% of the project duration period. This period includes business trips necessary for the project, in particular

[1] Acting as principal investigator applies to the period from the date of the funding agreement for a project funded under an NCN call until the day of submitting the final report on the completion of the research project.

involving fieldwork, participation in conferences and/or library and archive research. It does not apply to the PRELUDIUM BIS call.

§12. No person may manage more than one project financed in the MAESTRO call.

§13. No person may manage more than two projects financed in the PRELUDIUM BIS call.

§14. A person may act as the principal investigator under PRELUDIUM, SONATINA, SONATA and SONATA BIS calls only once.

§15. In one edition of calls, no proposal may be submitted with overlapping research tasks.

§16. Proposals covering research tasks overlapping with the tasks specified in a proposal submitted earlier may be submitted again only when the evaluation procedure of such earlier proposal is completed, subject to § 18.

§17. Proposals covering research tasks overlapping tasks specified in another proposal submitted earlier, with respect to which an appeal has been initiated, may only be submitted when the evaluation procedure of the earlier proposal is completed.

§18. The same proposal may not be submitted in two consecutive OPUS calls, with the exception of proposals that in such earlier call:

a) were approved for the second stage of merit-based evaluation;

b) were not approved for the second stage of merit-based evaluation merely on the grounds that they did not comply with the terms of the call, presented unjustified costs to be incurred or were submitted to a wrong panel;

c) were rejected at the eligibility stage.

§19. The Expert Team may choose 10% of proposals that have not been recommended for the second stage of merit-based evaluation, with the exception of proposals referred to in §18 (b), that can be submitted to the next edition of the OPUS call. If less than 10 proposals are not recommended for the second stage of merit-based evaluation, the Expert Team can only choose 1 proposal as such.

Chapter IV
Principles of submitting proposals

§20. Proposals in calls shall be submitted electronically via ZSUN/OSF, available at www.osf.opi.org.pl.

§21. Proposals shall be completed with information as specified in the proposal form in ZSUN/OSF. A template of the form shall published in the call announcement.

§22. Only complete proposals that meet all the requirements set forth in the relevant call announcement shall be eligible as call entries.

Chapter V
Principles of evaluating proposals in calls for research projects

§23. Proposals shall be subject to an eligibility check and merit-based evaluation.

§24. The eligibility check shall be performed by the Coordinators.

§25. A proposal may be disqualify for formal reasons at a later stage of evaluation.

§26. The eligibility check of proposals shall comprise:

1) verification of proposal's completeness;

2) verification whether the proposal meets all the eligibility criteria set forth in the call announcement;

3) verification whether the expenditures outlined in the proposal conform to the principles set forth in **Annex 2** hereto as regards costs in research projects.

§27. The merit-based evaluation shall be open only to proposals approved as eligible by the Coordinator.

§28. The merit-based evaluation of proposals shall be carried out by Expert Teams and external reviewers.

§29. The criteria set specified in the terms of the call set forth by the Council shall apply to merit-based evaluation of proposals.

§30. Evaluation of proposals under OPUS, PRELUDIUM, SONATINA, SONATA, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls shall be carried out in two stages:

1) **Stage I – qualification** carried out on the basis of data provided for in the proposal and annexes thereto, with the exception of a full project description. It consists of individual opinions made by two members of the Expert Team. In the case of a proposal which is assigned an auxiliary NCN Review Panel specifying disciplines covered by NCN review panels other than the one to which the proposal was submitted, the chair of the Expert Team may decide to seek a second opinion from a member of another Expert Team. All individual opinions shall be agreed upon by the Expert Team evaluating the proposal in the panel, to which it has been submitted. Approved for the second stage are research projects from the highest places of the first stage ranking list whose aggregate cost equals up to twice the sum of financial resources allocated by the Council for the call in specific disciplines or groups of disciplines. The amount of the funds is determined by the Council on the basis of an analysis of costs for each project in the proposals filed in specific disciplines or groups of disciplines and the priorities set by the Council.

2) **Stage II – specialist evaluation** made on the basis of information in the proposal and annexes thereto, with the exception of a short project description. It consists of individual opinions made by external reviewers who are not members of the Expert Team reviewing the proposal in stage I. It is followed by a consultation of the Expert Team that decides on the final evaluation of the proposal based on the individual reviews, analyses of and discussions on the proposals. In the SONATINA, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls, the final assessment of the proposal also covers the result of an interview with the principal investigator by members of the Expert Team. In the SONATINA and SONATA BIS calls, the interview is held in Polish or in English and in the MAESTRO call, the interview is held in English.

§31. In the PRELUDIUM BIS call, proposals shall be evaluated pursuant to §30, however, a research project description shall be subject to evaluation during stage I and stage II.

§32. The following principles shall apply to the evaluation of proposals by the Expert Team:

1) the project budget may not be modified;
2) the percentage contribution of specific criteria in the individual assessment of proposals and the nature of the assessments for each call are specified in **Annex 1** hereto;
3) each proposal is allotted a score which is of a supplementary nature and is a starting point to the discussion on the final score;
4) decisions of the Expert Team on the final score of a given proposal is based on an analysis thereof and a discussion on the legitimacy of funding the proposal against other proposals reviewed in the call;

5) the final score of the proposal at a given stage of the merit-based evaluation is reflected in its position on the ranking list after stage I or the ranking list after stage II, both lists being compiled by the Expert Team;
6) proposals with a zero score or “no” decision agreed by the Expert Team in any reviewed criterion may not be recommended for funding. It does not apply to the data management evaluation criteria or evaluation criteria of ethics issues in research;
7) proposals deemed incompliant with any requirements of the call announcement by the Expert Team may not be recommended for funding;

§33. Proposals for which the total funding requested is not in excess of the funds allotted by the Council for the call within individual disciplines or groups of disciplines shall be recommended for funding by the Expert Team, subject to §34.

§34. The Expert Team may conditionally recommend one proposal for funding, which partly falls within the amount of funds available for the call within individual disciplines or groups of disciplines.

§35. The funding decision with regard to proposals referred to in §34 shall be taken by the NCN Director, subject to the percentage indicator of the budget for the specific call being trespassed within individual disciplines or groups of disciplines.

§36. In justified instances, the Coordinator may, having consulted the Expert Team, change the order of funding proposals on the ranking list. The Coordinator shall submit such modified ranking list to the NCN Director for approval with a written justification.

§37. If the NCN Director’s decision to reject funding is cancelled by the Committee of Appeals of the NCN Council and the proposal is forwarded for reassessment, the following principles shall apply:

1) these Regulations shall apply to proposal reassessments which must be completed within 5 months of the date the decision by the Committee of Appeals of the NCN Council to cancel the NCN Director’s decision becomes final;
2) the assessment of a proposal may not be made by the experts and Coordinators were involved in the previous assessment that ended with a decision of the NCN Director which was subsequently cancelled by the Committee of Appeals of the NCN Council;
3) as a result of reassessment, the Expert Team shall issue an opinion on the legitimacy of funding the proposal assessed, subject to the level of proposals reviewed earlier in the call;
4) if the Expert Team issues a positive opinion, the Director shall approve it and issue a funding decision;
5) the decision referred to in item 4 shall have no legal or financial effects for the other applicants whose proposals have been approved for funding in the call even if the funds available in the call have already been used.

§38. In order to ensure impartiality of assessment throughout the proceedings, Article 32 of the NCN Act shall apply.

Prof. Dr hab. Małgorzata Kossowska

President of the Council of the
National Science Centre

Annex 1 to the Regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects, set forth in NCN Council Resolution No 61/2020 of 21 May 2020

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE CALLS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

I. Proposal evaluation criteria in the OPUS call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakładki.

- yes
- no

In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research**[3]**?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakładki.

- yes
- no

In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakładki.

- yes
- no

In the case of "no", please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 55%)

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

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals
1 Poor.

[2] This criterion is not subject to assessment by external reviewers.
[3] 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.

0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research:** :

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 40%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding, the principal investigator is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
4 Very good, the principal investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the field.
3 Good, the principal investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
2 Moderate, the principal investigator has national recognition in the field.
1 Modest, the principal investigator lacks recognition in the field.
0 The principal investigator has no scientific achievements.

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research.
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals.
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals.
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals.
0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the structure of the research team, research facilities, international cooperation (if any), etc.**

3 Very good.
2 Good.
1 Poor.
0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet the criteria allowing for its re-submission in a subsequent edition of the OPUS calls?**[4]

- yes
- no

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

[4] To be agreed by the expert team at stage I of merit-based evaluation.
[5] If the criterion does not apply to research, a “no” decision is given.
[6] Does not apply to proposals, to which auxiliary NCN Review Panels have been assigned, specifying disciplines covered by NCN panels other than the one to which the proposal was submitted.

II. Proposal evaluation criteria in the PRELUDIUM call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research**[3]**?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 75%)

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 60%)

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE(WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research**:

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific

field/discipline.

1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF TEAM MEMBERS (WEIGHTING 20%)

B1. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/ journals:**

5 Outstanding achievements of the principal investigator.
4 Very good achievements of the principal investigator.
3 Substantial achievements of the principal investigator.
2 Modest achievements of the principal investigator.
1 The principal investigator has no academic achievements.

Justification:

B2. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE MENTOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Scientific achievements of the mentor, including publications in academic press/ journals:**

5 Outstanding. The mentor is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
4 Very good. The mentor is an internationally recognized expert in the field.
3 Good. The mentor is internationally recognized in the field.
2 Moderate. The mentor has national recognition in the field.
1 Modest. The mentor lacks recognition in the field.
0 The mentor has no academic achievements.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the 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 regard to the subject and scope of the research?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

III. Proposal evaluation criteria in the PRELUDIUM BIS call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research**[3]**?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 35%)

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 20%)

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE(WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research**:

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 60%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding. The principal Investigator is one of the world's top researchers in the field
4 Very good. The principal investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the field.
3 Good. The principal investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
2 Moderate. The principal investigator has national recognition in the field.
1 Modest. The principal investigator lacks recognition in the field.
0 The principal investigator has no scientific achievements.

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding. The principal investigator is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
4 Very good. The principal investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the field.
3 Good. The principal investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
2 Moderate. The principal investigator has national recognition in the field.
1 Modest. The principal investigator lacks recognition in the field.
0 The principal investigator has no scientific achievements.

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals
0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, research facilities, justification of the choice of foreign**

fellowship location, 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?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

IV. Proposal evaluation criteria in the SONATINA call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific research**[7]**?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 55%)

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

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research**:

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

[7] Pursuant to Article 4 (2) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, research covers: a) basic research understood as experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any direct commercial application or use in view; b) applied research understood as an investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge and skills, directed primarily towards developing new products, processes or services or introducing significant improvements thereto.

Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 30%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding academic achievements
4 Significant academic achievements
3 Very good academic achievements
2 Good academic achievements
1 Poor academic achievements
0 No academic achievements

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals
0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the structure of the research team, research facilities, etc.**

3 Very good.
2 Good.
1 Poor.
0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

D. JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE OF FOREIGH FELLOWSHIP LOCATION (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Academic rank of a foreign research institution hosting the foreign fellowship of the principal investigator:**

5 Outstanding research institution, i.e. one of world's leading institution in its field.
4 Very good research institution, i.e. internationally acknowledged in its field.
3 Good research institution, i.e. internationally recognised in its field.
2 Average research institution, i.e. domestically recognised in its field.
1 Poor research institution.
0 Research institution with no achievements.

- **Appropriate choice of the research institution**:

1 Well chosen.

0 Poorly chosen.

- **Impact on the development of principal investigator's research career:**

2 The fellowship will have a significant impact on the development of the PI's scientific career by increasing the importance of publications, developing cooperation and participating in research projects.
1 The fellowship will have an impact on the development of the PI's scientific career.
0 The fellowship will have no impact on the development of the PI's scientific career.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

STAGE II OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

- **External reviews (in line with the criteria in stage I)**

- **Interview with the principal investigator**

Following the interview, the Expert Team decides on the recommendation for the proposal:

A Proposal recommended for funding.
B Proposal recommended for funding as second choice.
C Proposal not recommended for funding.

V. Proposal evaluation criteria in the SONATA call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research**[3]**?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 55%)

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

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE(WEIGHTING 15%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research**:

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 40%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding academic achievements.
4 Significant academic achievements.
3 Very good academic achievements.
2 Good academic achievements.
1 Poor academic achievements.
0 No academic achievements.

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research.
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals.
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals.
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals.
0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the 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 regard to the subject and scope of the research?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of “no”, please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

VI. Proposal evaluation criteria in the SONATA BIS call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research**[3]**?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 45%)

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 35%)

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals
1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research**:

3 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 40%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding. The Principal Investigator is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
4 Very good. The Principal Investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the field.
3 Good. The Principal Investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
2 Moderate. The Principal Investigator has national recognition in the field.
1 Modest. The Principal Investigator lacks recognition in the field.
0 The Principal Investigator has no scientific achievements.

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research.
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals.
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals.
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals.
0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. EVALUATION OF THE RATIONALE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW RESEARCH TEAM (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **In relation to the proposed scope of research, the composition and the size of the research team is:**

3 Very well planned.
1 Adequate.
0 Inadequate.

Justification:

D. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, 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?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

STAGE II OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

- **External reviews (in line with the criteria in stage I)**

- **PI Interview**

Following the interview, the Expert Team decides on the recommendation for the proposal:

A Proposal recommended for funding.
B Proposal recommended for funding as second choice.
C Proposal not recommended for funding

VII. Proposal evaluation criteria in the MAESTRO call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research[3]?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the principal investigator meet the eligibility criteria for an advanced investigator[8]?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[2]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 40%)

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 30%)

5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals.
2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.

[8] Advanced investigator is a person holding at least a PhD degree, who in the proposal submission year or within 10 years prior to the proposal submission year:

a) has published at least five papers in prestigious Polish or foreign academic press/ journals
b) has coordinated at least two research projects funded in national or international calls for proposals,
c) fulfils at least three of the criteria below:
- has been a member of a scientific committee of at least one renowned international conference,
- has published at least one monograph,
- has delivered presentations at renowned international conferences,
- has received an international award or prize,
- has been or was a member of renowned associations, international scientific organisations or academia,
- has other significant scientific achievements,

and in the case of research in the field of arts, a person who is an author of works of art of international significance or works significant for the Polish culture and has actively participated in international exhibitions, festivals or other artistic events in visual, musical, theatrical or film arts.

1 Poor.
0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/ DISCIPLINE(WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Innovative nature of the proposed research:**

4 The project is ground-breaking.
2 The project is innovative.
1 The project has innovative elements.
0 The project has no innovative elements.

- **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/ discipline:**

3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 50%)

- **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned academic press/journals:**

6 Highest global rank, the Principal Investigator is at the forefront of world's research in the field.
5 Outstanding. The Principal Investigator is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
4 Exceptional, the Principal Investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the field.
3 Very good, the Principal Investigator is an internationally recognised specialist in the field.
2 Good, the Principal Investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
1 Moderate, the Principal Investigator has national recognition in the field.
0 Modest, the Principal Investigator lacks recognition in the field.

- **Assessment of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science:**

5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
4 The results of the completed projects have been published in mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research.
3 The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals.
2 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals.
1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/ journals.

0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 10%)

Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the 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?**[2]

- yes
- no
In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Has the data management been duly planned?**[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues in research been duly addressed**?[5]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

- **Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?**[6]

- yes
- no
In the case of "no", please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

STAGE II OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

- **External reviews (in line with the criteria in stage I)**

- **PI interview**

Following the interview, the Expert Team decides on the recommendation for the proposal.

A Proposal recommended for funding.

B Proposal recommended for funding as second choice.

C Proposal not recommended for funding.

Prof. Dr hab. Małgorzata Kossowska

President of the Council of the
National Science Centre

Annex 2 to the Regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects, set forth in NCN Council Resolution No 61/2020 of 21 March 2020

COSTS IN RESEARCH PROJECTS

Drawing up a budget of a research project is one of the crucial stages of its planning. When drawing up the budget, emphasis should be put on determining the required resources and exact estimation of expenses.

The budget must be well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research, based on real calculations and itemize expenses to be covered from the NCN resources (so-called eligible costs) in individual years of the project's implementation. In the PRELUDIUM and SONATINA calls, the budget is to be planned for the entire period of the project's implementation, without split into years.

ELIGIBLE COSTS are expenditures eligible for funding from NCN resources as long as they fulfil all of the following requirements:

1) are critical to the completion of the project,
2) have been incurred in the period of eligibility, i.e. from the day on which the decision of the NCN Director to grant funding becomes legally binding until the final date of the research project's implementation,
3) are advisable and frugal;
4) may be identified and verified,
5) conforming with all rules and regulations, including the rules and regulations of the host institution and the rules and regulations of the NCN, including the rules set forth herein;
6) in the case of entities applying for state aid, they comply with Article 12 of the Regulation on the terms and mode of granting state aid via the National Science Centre adopted by the Minister of Science and Higher Education on 9 September 2015 (Journal of Laws of 2015, item 1381).

The following shall not be deemed eligible costs:

1) provisions for future liabilities, debt interest and other debt servicing expenses, interest and other amounts due on account of late payments, contractual penalties, fines, penalties and expenses to cover the costs of litigation,
2) VAT if the host institution is entitled to reclaim VAT,
3) fees for pre-publishing reviews,
4) leasing of research equipment,
5) costs of NCN research scholarships, doctoral scholarships and costs of reduced obligatory teaching load in the case of entities applying for state aid
6) cost of publication of monographs[9] resulting from research projects which have not been positively reviewed by the NCN and
7) Article Publishing Charging in hybrid journals, as defined in the Open Access Policy at the NCN.

[9] As defined in §10 of the Regulation on evaluation of the quality of research activity issued by the Minister of Science and Higher Education on 22 February 2019 (Journal of Laws of 2019, item 392).

The eligibility of costs is checked during the proposal evaluation, evaluation of the annual report, evaluation of the final report and during the external control and audit.

Eligible costs are subdivided into direct and indirect costs.

1. Indirect costs are costs that are related indirectly to the research project and essential for it to be implemented.

The maximum amount of indirect costs is 20% of the direct costs.

Additionally, indirect costs of up to 2% of direct costs may be spent on Open Access to publications and research data.

2. Direct costs are costs directly related to the completion of the research projects and they include:

- costs of salaries and scholarships,
- costs of research equipment, devices and software,
- costs of foreign fellowships,
- costs of reducing the obligatory teaching load,
- other direct costs.

The following expenditures may not be financed as direct costs:

1) salaries of the administrative and financial staff (HR services, legal and accounting services, including the outsourcing of accounting services to an accounting office),
2) costs of renovation of facilities,
3) costs of adapting/upgrading facilities so that they can meet the needs of the research tasks,
4) fees and rent for the use of facilities, property taxes, etc.,
5) costs of utilities (electricity, heat, gas and water and other industrial fees, transmission fees, sewage disposal, etc.), telecommunications services (telephone, Internet) and postal and courier services, excluding the services referred to in point 2.5.2,
6) costs of cleaning, janitorial and security services to facilities,
7) costs of non-life insurance,
8) handling and administrative fees,
9) costs of banking services, including: opening and maintaining a sub-account or separate account for the research project, bank fees,
10) costs of external audits,
11) costs of organising conferences, workshops, seminars and meetings (with the exception of personnel costs specified in points 2.5.3 and 2.5.4),
12) costs of subscriptions (with the exception of the costs of data and access to data referred to in point 2.5.6),
13) fees for membership in organisations, associations, etc.,
14) costs of proceedings related to conferment of academic degrees/titles and
15) cost of publication of scientific articles or cost of open access to research data, with the exception of services referred to in point 2.5.2.

All the expenses outlined above in points 1-15 may be covered as indirect costs.

2.1. Costs of salaries and scholarships - this category covers costs of salaries and non-wage labour costs and costs of scholarships anticipated only for persons employed as members of the research team, i.e. the principal investigator and other investigators.

Budget for salaries and scholarships for members of the research team may include:

a) full-time remuneration,
b) additional remuneration,
c) salaries and scholarships for students and PhD students.

2.1.1. Full-time remuneration

Full-time remuneration may be planned under full-time employment contracts at the host institution in positions dedicated to perform tasks in the research project for:

a) the principal investigator in the SONATINA, SONATA, OPUS, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls;
b) persons employed as post-docs in the SONATA, OPUS, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls;
c) persons in specialist supporting positions in the SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls.

A post-doc type post is a full-time post, scheduled by the project's principal investigator for a person who has obtained their PhD degree within 7 years before joining the project. This period may be extended by a time of long-term (in excess of 90 days) documented sick leaves or rehabilitation leaves granted on account of being unfit to work. In addition, the period may be extended by the number of months of a child care leave granted pursuant to the Labour Code and in the case of women, by 18 months for every child born or adopted, whichever manner of accounting for career breaks is preferable.

Specialist supporting positions are full-time employment positions planned by the principal investigator for a person involved in solving research problems related to the project, with specialist knowledge and experience, such as *lab-manager*, *senior technician*, etc.

Full-time remuneration for the project's principal investigator may be planned under research project funds as follows:

- PLN 190,000 per annum in the MAESTRO call;
- PLN 160,000 per annum in the SONATA BIS call;
- PLN 150,000 per annum in the OPUS call;
- PLN 140,000 per annum in the SONATA call and
- PLN 100,000 per annum in the SONATINA call;

provided that in the period of receiving remuneration the project's principal investigator will be meeting all of the following conditions:

a) they will be receiving no other remuneration granted under the heading of direct costs in research projects funded under NCN calls;
b) they will be receiving no remuneration from another employer pursuant to an employment contract, including an employer with registered office outside of Poland;
c) they will not be receiving pension from the social security system.

Full-time remuneration for the principal investigator may be planned for a period shorter

than the duration of the research project reduced in proportion to the period for which it is planned, with the exception of the SONATINA call.

Full-time remuneration for a post-doc type post may be planned under research project funds of PLN 120,000 per annum provided that in that period the person to be employed at the post meets all of the following conditions:

a) they are selected by means of open competition procedure, carried out by a recruitment committee appointed by the head of the project's host entity, composed of the project's principal investigator as its chair and at least two other persons appointed by the principal investigator, who have necessary scientific or professional qualifications. The assessment of the candidates is carried out pursuant to the criteria outlined in the call announcement and the results are made public by posting on the website of the project's host institution;
b) their PhD degree has been awarded by another institution than the one planned to employ them at this post;.
c) they will be employed for a period of at least 6 months;
d) at the time of receiving remuneration, they will not be receiving any other remuneration paid from the funds granted to research projects under NCN calls under the heading of direct costs;
e) in the period of receiving the remuneration they will be receiving no remuneration from another employer pursuant to an employment contract, including an employer with registered office outside of Poland.

Full-time remuneration for a person at a post-doc type post may be planned for a period shorter than the duration of the research project reduced in proportion to the period for which it is planned.

The amount of remuneration can be increased where justified by the specific circumstances set forth in the proposal. The reasons for an increased remuneration shall be subject to the evaluation by the Expert Team.

In the OPUS, SONATA and SONATA BIS calls, it is possible to employ persons in post-doc type posts provided that the total employment period of all such persons does not exceed twice the time of the planned project duration.

In the MAESTRO call, it is possible to create a new post-doc type post or posts for the total period of 36 months provided that the total employment period of all such persons does not exceed twice the time of the planned project duration.

Full-time remuneration for a specialist supporting position of up to PLN 85,000 per annum may be planned within the funds for the research project provided that during that time all of the following conditions are met by the person to be employed at that position:

a) he/she will be employed for at least 6 months;
b) when the remuneration is paid, he/she will not be paid any other remuneration from the funds allocated as direct costs under research projects funded in NCN calls;

c) when the remuneration is paid, he/she will be receiving no remuneration from another employer pursuant to an employment contract, including an employer with registered office outside of Poland.

The full-time remuneration for a person in a specialist supporting position may be planned for a period shorter than the duration of the research project reduced in proportion to the period for which it is planned.

In the SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls, it is possible to create one specialist supporting position that may be performed by more than one person provided that the total employment period of all such persons in the position does not exceed the planned project duration.

2.1.2. Additional remuneration[10]:

Additional remuneration may be planned for members of the research team to be employed pursuant to full- or part-time employment contracts as well as pursuant to civil law contracts. Additional remuneration cannot be used for salaries for students and PhD students, with the exception of the PRELUDIUM and SONATINA calls.

Research team members employed pursuant to an employment contract by a host institution may receive additional remuneration only in a form other than pursuant to a civil law contract.

The budget for additional remuneration shall be calculated in such a way as to exclude persons employed under the budget for full-time salaries and budget for salaries and scholarships for students and PhD students (if applicable in the call) from the research team. The number of persons calculated as such shall be the basis for the calculation of the maximum budget for additional remuneration in a given research project. The maximum budget for additional remuneration planned for the principal investigator may not be increased once the project has entered the stage of implementation.

In the MAESTRO call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for all investigators shall be up to:

a) when the principal investigator does not plan to be employed under full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 6,000 for one person;
   - PLN 7,500 for two persons, of which up to PLN 6,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 8,500 for three persons, of which up to PLN 6,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 9,500 for four persons, of which up to PLN 6,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 10,500 for five or more persons, including a maximum of PLN 6,000 for the principal investigator.
b) when the principal investigator plans to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 1,500 for one person;
   - PLN 2,500 for two persons;
   - PLN 3,500 for three persons;
   - PLN 4,500 for four or more persons.

[10] The employment paid for from the pool allocated for additional remuneration is not subject to restrictions set forth in point 2.1.1.

In the SONATA BIS call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for all investigators shall be up to:

a) when the principal investigator does not plan to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 5,000 for one person;
   - PLN 6,500 for two persons, of which up to PLN 5,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 7,500 for three persons, of which up to PLN 5,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 8,500 for four or more persons, of which up to PLN 5,000 for the principal investigator.
b) when the principal investigator plans to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 1,500 per one person;
   - PLN 2,500 for two persons;
   - PLN 3,500 for three or more persons.

In the OPUS call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for all investigators shall be up to:

a) when the principal investigator does not plan to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 3,000 for one person;
   - PLN 4,500 for two persons, of which up to PLN 3,000 for the principal investigator;
   - PLN 5,500 for three or more persons, of which up to PLN 3,000 for the principal investigator.
b) when the principal investigator plans to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 1,500 for one person;
   - PLN 2,500 for two or more persons.

In the SONATA call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for all investigators shall be up to:

a) when the principal investigator does not plan to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 2,000 for one person;
   - PLN 3,500 for two or more persons, of which up to PLN 2,000 for the principal investigator.
b) when the principal investigator plans to be employed under the full-time remuneration:
   - PLN 1,500 for one or more persons.

In the SONATINA call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for all investigators, with the exception of the principal investigator, shall be up to PLN 1,500.

In the PRELUDIUM call, the budget for additional remuneration per each month of the project's implementation for the principal investigator and all the other investigators shall be up to PLN 1,500.

In the PRELUDIUM BIS call, the budget for additional remuneration may only be allocated to the principal investigator, provided that the total additional remuneration planned for the

principal investigator and costs of the research project referred to in item 2.5.7 shall not exceed PLN 40,000 for the whole duration of the research project.

2.1.3. Salaries and scholarships for students[11] and PhD students [12]

This category covers the costs of salaries and non-wage labour costs as well as costs of scholarships planned for students and PhD students to be involved in the completion of the tasks in the project.

From the budget for salaries and scholarships for students and PhD students, it is possible to plan funds for:

a) NCN scholarships for students and PhD students,
b) doctoral scholarships,
c) salaries for students and PhD students and
d) doctoral scholarships under PRELUDIUM BIS.

The budget for salaries and scholarships for students and PhD students per each month of the project's implementation shall be up to:

- PLN 5,000 in the SONATA call;
- PLN 10,000 in the OPUS and SONATA BIS calls;
- PLN 15,000 in the MAESTRO call.

PRELUDIUM BIS doctoral scholarships shall be awarded in the amount of PLN 5,000 per month in the first half and PLN 6,000 per month in the second half of the project implementation period.

NCN scholarships for students and PhD students may be planned, provided that they are awarded pursuant to the *Regulations for awarding scholarships for NCN-funded research projects* set forth by the NCN Council.

Doctoral scholarships may be planned provided that the PhD students meet the requirements set forth in the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, which entitle them to receive doctoral scholarships throughout the performance period of the tasks planned in the project.

Salaries for students and PhD students may be planned for employment under full-time or part-time employment contracts or civil law contracts for the completion of tasks in a research project. Students and PhD students employed under employment contracts in the host institution for the project may not be paid remuneration under a civil law contract.

PRELUDIUM BIS doctoral scholarships shall amount to:

- PLN 5,000 per month, by the month in which a PhD student's mid-term evaluation is performed at the doctoral school and

- PLN 6,000 per month, by the month in which a PhD student's mid-term evaluation is performed at the doctoral school and

shall be awarded pursuant to the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018,

[11] Students of first or second-cycle degree programme or uniform Master's studies at universities in Poland.
[12] Participants in PhD programmes pursuant to the Act on Higher Education of 27 July 2005 or PhD students at doctoral schools pursuant to the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018.

provided that a PhD student is selected in a call in compliance with the terms below.

The call is open to all those who are not PhD holders and are not students at the doctoral schools. The call shall be held by a committee appointed by the head of the host institution for the project acting as the applicant, comprising the principal investigator as the chair and at least two persons appointed thereby with appropriate academic or professional qualifications. The committee shall evaluate the candidates by awarding them points for their competencies to perform specific tasks in a research project and scientific achievements to date. On the basis thereof, the committee shall rank the candidates according to the following criteria:

- competencies to perform specific tasks in a research project (70% of the final score)

3 points	very good
2 points	good
1 point	poor
0 points	no competencies

- publication track record, including publications in renowned scientific papers/ magazines (30% of the final score):

4 points	prominent
3 points	very good
2 points	good
1 point	poor
0 points	no publication track record

The National Science Centre shall be notified of the call results.

In the SONATA, OPUS, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls, funding in the budget for salaries and scholarships for students and PhD students may be planned for a given person in any form listed under letters a) –c). In the case of projects carried out in an institution for which funding constitutes state aid, funds for students and PhD students can only be planned in the form listed under letter c).

The total amount of NCN-funded salaries and scholarships intended for students and PhD students in one or more research projects funded by the NCN cannot exceed PLN 5,000 per month. This amount shall not include doctoral scholarships funded in the ETIUDA call nor the remuneration for the principal investigator in the PRELUDIUM call.

In the PRELUDIUM BIS call, funds for PhD students can only be planned in the form listed under letter d). PhD students receiving PRELUDIUM BIS doctoral scholarships cannot receive any scholarship or other remuneration granted under the heading of direct costs in other research projects funded by the NCN, with the exception of remuneration for the principal investigator in the PRELUDIUM call.

2.2. Costs of research equipment, devices and software – this category covers the costs of purchase or construction of research equipment, other devices and software crucial to research. Costs of research equipment, devices and software may be planned in the PRELUDIUM, OPUS, SONATA, SONATA BIS and MAESTRO calls.

Project funds may not be used to finance or co-finance the purchase or construction of research equipment and IT infrastructure with a value in excess of PLN 500,000 per unit.

Research equipment (*as defined by the Central Statistical Office*) shall mean a set(s) of testing, measurement or laboratory apparatus of limited application and high technical parameters (usually several orders of magnitude higher than typical apparatus used for production or exploitation purposes), which in accordance with the accounting policy of the host institution constitute the host institution's fixed assets.

Other devices – other devices outside the scope of the definition of research equipment which in accordance with the accounting policy of the host institution constitute the host institution's fixed assets.

Software – software purchased to meet the requirements of the research project, which in accordance with the accounting policy of the host institution constitutes the host institution's intangible assets.

In the case of research equipment, devices and software constituting fixed assets or intangible assets subject to depreciation pursuant to the Accounting Act of 29 September 1994, eligible costs shall include the purchase price or construction costs of fixed assets or intangible assets within the meaning of the Act, including the total costs incurred by the host institution for the project by the day they of taking them into use, taking into account different criteria of eligibility of state aid.

In the case of entities applying for state aid, the costs of research equipment, devices and software qualify as eligible costs to the extent and for the period in which they are used for the implementation of the research project. If the research equipment and devices are not used for the research project purposes over the entire period of use, only depreciation costs corresponding to the period of project's completion, calculated pursuant to the accounting regulations, are deemed eligible costs.

2.3 **Costs of foreign fellowships** – this category includes the costs of foreign fellowships covering:

a) beneficiary's living expenses at a foreign research institution hosting the fellowship, calculated as a lump sum of:
   - PLN 12,000 per month in the SONATINA call, multiplied by the percentage correction rate set for a given country, according to the terms set forth in Annex 1;

b) return travel expenses calculated as a lump sum of:
   - PLN 1,000 - PLN 10,000 in the SONATINA call, depending on the distance between the host institution and the research institution hosting the fellowship, according to the terms set forth in Annex 2.

2.4. **Costs of reducing the obligatory teaching load** – the institution employing the principal investigator pursuant to a full-time employment contract may be provided with funding to cover the reduction by 50% of the principal investigator's obligatory teaching load, equivalent to PLN 100 per each teaching hour reduced.

Funds to cover the principal investigator's reduced obligatory teaching load may be planned in the SONATA and SONATA BIS calls.

2.5. **Other direct costs** – this category covers costs not classified as "Costs of salaries and scholarships" or "Costs of research equipment, devices and software".

2.5.1. Materials and small equipment – costs of purchasing materials and consumables for direct use over the course of the project, including:

- raw-materials, semi-finished products, reagents,
- office supplies, stationery,
- small laboratory equipment, IT hardware and small office devices (e.g. computers, software licence and development costs, printers, scanners, monitors, copiers) and other devices, as long as pursuant to the accounting policy of the host institution they are not classified as fixed assets or intangible assets.

2.5.2. Outsourcing –costs of services rendered by third parties (institutions and individuals with a business activity), including:

- costs of purchasing research services (laboratory analyses, statistical repots, surveys, etc.),
- costs of purchasing other specialist services necessary for due completion of the research (proofreading, editing, graphics, consulting, monitoring, etc.),
- costs of postal, courier and transport services directly related to the completion of a given research task,
- costs of manuscript translation and editing and
- costs of premises rental, catering, etc., as necessary for the completion of the research tasks that include subjects/respondents.

Recipients of salaries or scholarships funded by the NCN in the project may not be involved in research tasks as subcontractors directly or indirectly (via institutions that employ them).

2.5.3. Business trips – costs of business trips of research team members, including:

- costs of participation in seminars/conferences related to the subject of the project,
- costs of trips critical to the completion of the research, e.g. preliminary archival and library research, fieldwork, etc.

The costs of business trips include:

- daily allowances and reimbursement of travel expenses as set forth in the regulations passed pursuant to Article 77^5 § 2 of the Polish Labour Code,
- personal insurance,
- conference fees,
- other costs, as long as they are considered justified and essential to the completion of the project, such as visas, vaccinations, etc.

Costs of long-term trips may be eligible if they have been calculated in line with the principle of advisability and frugality, on the basis of the actual expenses.

2.5.4. Visits and consultations – costs of visits by external collaborators and/or consultants closely related to the project. In this category eligible shall be only personal costs in the form of allowances, reimbursement of travel expenses and accommodation costs.

2.5.5. Collective investigators – total cost of compensation for persons carrying out one-time responsibilities (e.g. interviewers,) and participants in research. The minimum number of such investigators is 5. This category does not include technicians and lab managers.

A detailed budget must be submitted, describing the purpose of the expenses and the overall cost as well as the number of benefit recipients, value and form of benefit (monetary or

material).

2.5.6. Other costs – other costs that fall in none of the previous categories, such as:

- costs of purchasing data/databases or access thereto,
- specialist publications/teaching aids and
- costs of publication of monographs that may be incurred once positively reviewed by the NCN.

The research project may include actions intended to promote it and disseminate its results. Anticipated costs generated by such actions, as long as they meet the conditions of eligibility, shall be entered in the categories of *"Costs of salaries and scholarships", "Outsourcing", etc.,* accordingly.

2.5.7 Costs of the principal investigator in the PRELUDIUM BIS call – costs of the research project planned for the principal investigator **that fall in the previous categories,** provided that the total costs planned for the principal investigator in connection with the research project and cost of additional remuneration thereof referred to in item 2.1.2 shall not exceed PLN 40,000 for the whole duration of the research project.

List of countries where foreign fellowship can be planned

Lump sum funds specified in the Regulations to cover the living expenses at a research institution hosting the foreign fellowship shall be multiplied by the percentage correction rate set for a given country[13], according to the values set forth in the tables below.

Table 1. EU Member States

Austria	106.7	**Cyprus**	82.6	**Finland**	120.8	**Holland**	107.9	**Latvia**	77.7	**Romania**	68.8	**Hungary**	77.4
Belgium	100	**Czechia**	81.78	**France**	115.7	**Ireland**	115.6	**Malta**	84.4	**Slovakia**	80.4	**United Kingdom**	139.8
Bulgaria	62	**Denmark**	135	**Greece**	88.7	**Lithuania**	72.5	**Germany**	97	**Slovenia**	86.1	**Italy**	104.4
Croatia	83.9	**Estonia**	79.4	**Spain**	95.4	**Luxembourg**	100	**Portugal**	84.2	**Sweden**	121.8		

Table 2. Countries outside of the EU

Albania	65.3	**Eritrea**	98.9	**Kyrgyzstan**	80.3	**Nicaragua**	56.5	**Tajikistan**	62.2
Algeria	74	**Ethiopia**	85.1	**Columbia**	77.9	**Norway**	130.6	**Thailand**	71.6
Angola	128.1	**Fiji**	68.1	**Kongo**	120.6	**New Caledonia**	117.2	**Taiwan**	82.7
Saudi Arabia	80.8	**Philippines**	73.4	**South Korea**	97.6	**New Zealand**	99.4	**Tanzania**	65.4
Argentina	65.6	**Gabon**	107.8	**Kosovo**	65.5	**Pakistan**	51.9	**East Timor**	89.4
Armenia	75.4	**Gambia**	69	**Costa Rica**	82.1	**Palestine**	110.8	**Togo**	84.4
Australia	104.4	**Ghana**	64.1	**Cuba**	78.6	**Panama**	63.2	**Tonga**	85
Azerbaijan	88.3	**Georgia**	75.3	**Laos**	89.2	**Papua New Guinea**	101.5	**Trinidad and Tobago**	81
Bangladesh	61.1	**Guyana**	62.2	**Lesotho**	48.3	**Paraguay**	69	**Tunisia**	67.5
Barbados	112.5	**Guatemala**	82.6	**Lebanon**	86.3	**Peru**	80.2	**Turkey**	82.1
Belize	77	**Guinea**	73.7	**Liberia**	111.1	**South Africa**	50.8	**Uganda**	70.5
Benin	97	**Guinea-Bissau**	96.6	**Libya**	57.6	**Central African Republic**	108.6	**Ukraine**	70.8
Bermuda	151.5	**Haiti**	94.6	**Liechtenstein**	121.2	**Cape Verde**	71.7	**Uruguay**	84.3
Belarus	59.5	**Honduras**	73.4	**North Macedonia**	60	**Russia**	105.4	**Uzbekistan**	66.5
Bolivia	67.5	**Hong Kong**	100.4	**Madagascar**	86	**Rwanda**	82.5	**Vanuatu**	108
Bosnia and Herzegovina	69	**India**	63.4	**Malawi**	68	**Salvador**	69.6	**Venezuela**	90.2
Botswana	51.7	**Indonesia**	69.8	**Malesia**	68.8	**Samoa**	83	**Vietnam**	53.3
Brazil	97.9	**Island**	115.3	**Mali**	94.4	**Senegal**	94.7	**Côte d'Ivoire**	98.3
Burkina Faso	96.6	**Israel**	106.1	**Morocco**	75.4	**Serbia**	67.3	**Faroe Islands**	135
Chile	58.9	**Jamaica**	92	**Mauritania**	62.5	**Sierra Leone**	106.8	**Solomon Islands**	107.4
China	91.7	**Japan**	105.5	**Mauritius**	74.4	**Singapore**	113	**Zambia**	77.4
Chad	117.8	**Yemen**	81.1	**Mexico**	67.1	**Sri Lanka**	69.9	**Zimbabwe**	91.8
Montenegro	64.8	**Jordan**	86.5	**Moldavia**	62.01	**United States of America**	99.1		
Democratic Republic of Kongo	137.4	**Cambodia**	74.5	**Mozambique**	71.5	**Eswatini**	53.5		
Dominican Republic	62.9	**Cameroon**	96	**Namibia**	61.4	**Sudan**	99.7		
Djibouti	86.5	**Canada**	87.8	**Nepal**	77	**Suriname**	56		
Egypt	57.9	**Kazakhstan**	81.9	**Niger**	84.8	**Syria**	77.2		
Ecuador	75.5	**Kenia**	81.5	**Nigeria**	92.6	**Switzerland**	121.2		

[13] Drawn up pursuant to "HORIZON 2020 – Work Programme 2018-2020, *3. Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions"*, European Commission Decision C (2018)4708 of 24 July 2018.

Amount allocated to cover the travel expenses for a foreign fellowship

The shortest distance between the host institution and the research institution hosting the foreign fellowship [km][14]	Flat-rate amount [PLN/person]
< 500	1000
500 – 999	2000
1000 – 1499	3000
1500 – 2499	4000
2500 – 4999	6000
5000 – 10 000	8000
> 10 000	10 000

Prof. Dr hab. Małgorzata Kossowska

President of the Council of
the National Science Centre

[14] Fractions equal to 0.5 or over shall be rounded up, whilst fractions below 0.5 shall be rounded down.