

Annex 1 to
Order No 37 of 2023 by the Director of the
National Science Centre adopting an
additional evaluation procedure for
proposals submitted to the international
IMPRESS-U call

Article 1

Abbreviations and Definitions

Whenever this Order refers 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 (Journal of Laws of 2023, item 153);
- 3) Council, it shall mean the Council of the National Science Centre;
- 4) Director, it shall mean the Director of the National Science Centre;
- 5) Scientific Coordinators, they shall mean Scientific Coordinators within the meaning of Article 2 (5) of the NCN Act;
- 6) Regulations, they shall mean the Regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre under the international IMPRESS-U call carried out as a multilateral collaboration pursuant to the Lead Agency Procedure;
- 7) projects, they shall mean research projects within the meaning of Article 2 (2) of the NCN Act, financed under NCN calls;
- 8) IMPRESS-U call, it shall mean the international call launched by the NCN and carried out in multilateral cooperation with partner institutions pursuant to the Lead Agency Procedure with the National Science Foundation (NSF) acting as the lead agency;
- 9) lead agency, it shall mean the National Science Foundation competent for the coordinating applicant, in charge of a merit-based evaluation of joint proposals;
- 10) Polish research team, it shall mean the principal investigator identified in the NCN proposal together with the research team members, if identified in the NCN proposal;
- 11) NCN proposal, it shall mean a proposal for NCN-funding of the Polish part of the project under the IMPRESS-U call, including a joint proposal submitted to the lead agency;
- 12) joint proposal, it shall mean a proposal drafted by the co-applicants and submitted to the lead agency's call by the coordinating applicant pursuant to the lead agency's terms;
- 13) proposal recommended for funding, it shall mean an NCN proposal for funding of the Polish part of the research project, recommended for funding by the lead agency following its merit-based evaluation; and
- 14) Expert, it shall mean an Expert evaluating NCN proposals recommended for funding under the IMPRESS-U call, requested by the NCN Director pursuant to Article 22 (2) of the NCN Act.

Article 2

General terms

1. An Expert appointed by the Director pursuant to Article 22 (2) of the NCN Act shall make an additional evaluation of NCN proposals.
2. The costs of proposals recommended for funding shall be subject to an additional evaluation to ensure that they are reasonable.
3. In the case of doubt following an eligibility check performed by a Discipline Coordinator or merit-based evaluation performed by the lead agency, the criteria laid down in Article 2 (6) (1) – Article 2 (6) (3) shall also be subject to an additional evaluation.
4. The evaluation shall be performed pursuant to the Regulations in force on the date thereof.

5. The Experts shall comply with the Code of Ethics for Experts of the National Science Centre in force on the date the proposal is submitted for evaluation.
6. The Experts shall be excluded from the proposal evaluation procedure by a Scientific Coordinator in the case of a conflict of interest or justified suspicion of their impartiality.
7. NCN proposals may be evaluated in the event of:
 - 1) any doubt as to whether basic research is performed,
 - 2) any reservations to the ethic issues, or
 - 3) a need to confirm the non-commercial nature of the research that includes clinical trials with a medicinal product or a medical device.

Article 3 Experts

1. The tasks of the Experts shall include drafting individual reviews pursuant to the Director's recommendations and evaluation sheet for the assignment.

Article 4 Scientific Coordinators

1. The NCN Coordinator's tasks shall be as follows:
 - 1) organisation of the evaluation procedure, including:
 - providing Experts with the proposals for evaluation and other necessary materials available to the Coordinator (e.g. reviews and materials provided by the lead agency)
 - collecting Experts' evaluations,
 - 2) evaluation of the reliability and impartiality of the reviews drafted by the Expert(s).

Article 5 Proposal evaluation criteria

1. The evaluation referred to in Article 2 (1) shall be made by a single Expert. The evaluation sheets are set out in Annex 1, 2, 3 or 4 hereto, as appropriate.
2. If, following an individual review, the costs outlined in the proposal are deemed unreasonable or the evaluation is unsuccessful, the Director shall have an additional individual review made by another Expert.
3. Following an additional individual review made by another Expert, an online Expert meeting shall be held to agree upon the final decision according to the criteria laid down in Annexes 1, 2, 3 or 4.
4. The Scientific Coordinator shall be responsible for holding the online meetings.
5. Prior to an online meeting, the Scientific Coordinator shall provide an Expert evaluating the proposals with access to the individual reviews made by the other Expert.
6. A joint decision shall be agreed upon at the meeting and the final justification shall be drafted.
7. If the Experts cannot agree upon a joint decision at the meeting, the Director shall have a third evaluation made by another Expert which shall be discussed at an online meeting of the three Experts, and the final decision on the criterion concerned shall be taken by vote.

The English version of this Order does not constitute a sworn translation and has been prepared as an auxiliary document for your convenience. In case of any doubts as to the interpretation of its provisions, the Polish version shall prevail.

EVALUATION SHEET: EVALUATION OF COSTS

EVALUATION OF NCN FUNDING PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL IMPRESS-U CALL RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE AMERICAN NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AS THE LEAD AGENCY WITH REGARD TO THE RATIONALE OF THE COSTS AS REGARDS THE SUBJECT AND SCOPE OF RESEARCH

The evaluation covers solely the rationale of the costs planned in the NCN proposal as regards the subject and scope of research. The merit-based evaluation of the scientific quality of the research project covered by the NCN proposal has been performed by the lead agency according to its rules and consequently the project was recommended for funding.

Costs covered by NCN proposals are:

- A. **reasonable** as regards the subject and scope of research
(no justification needed)
- B. **unreasonable** as regards the subject and scope of research; the cost covered by the proposal recommended for funding are unreasonable as regards the subject and scope of research to an extent that prevents the implementation of the Polish part of the project
(justification needed, at least 1000 characters with spaces, please specify each unreasonable cost item and clarify why it is must not be borne)

EVALUATION SHEET: BASIC RESEARCH

EVALUATION OF NCN FUNDING PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL IMPRESS-U CALL TO CONFIRM THAT THE POLISH PART OF THE PROJECT COVERS BASIC RESEARCH

The evaluation covers solely the confirmation that the Polish part of the project covers basic research. The merit-based evaluation of the scientific quality of the research project covered by the NCN proposal is performed by the lead agency according to its rules.

Does the Polish part of the project cover basic research?

- A. **Pass:** basic research will be performed
(no justification needed)
- B. **Fail:** basic research will not be performed
(justification needed, at least 1000 characters with spaces)

EVALUATION SHEET: ETHIC ISSUES

EVALUATION OF NCN PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL IMPRESS-U CALL AS REGARDS THE ETHICS ISSUES OF THE POLISH PART OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The evaluation covers solely the confirmation that the research tasks in the Polish part of the project raise no doubts as regards the ethics issues. The merit-based evaluation of the scientific quality of the project covered by the NCN proposal is performed by lead agency according to its rules.

Have the ethics issues been duly addressed in the Polish part of the research?

- A. **Pass:** the ethics issues have been duly addressed
(no justification needed)
- B. **Pass with reservations:** the ethics issues have been duly addressed however certain irregularities have been identified that must be corrected during the project performance
(justification needed, at least 1000 characters with spaces, provide recommendations)
- C. **Fail:** the ethics issues have not been duly addressed however certain irregularities have been identified which prevent the project from being properly performed
(justification needed, at least 1000 characters with spaces)

EVALUATION SHEET: NON-COMMERCIAL NATURE OF CLINICAL TRIALS

EVALUATION OF NCN PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL IMPRESS-U CALL AS REGARDS THE NON-COMMERCIAL NATURE OF RESEARCH COVERED BY THE POLISH PART OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT WITH A MEDICINAL PRODUCT OR A MEDICAL DEVICE

The evaluation covers solely the confirmation that the clinical trials with a medical product or medical device in the Polish part of the project are non-commercial. The merit-based evaluation of the scientific quality of the project covered by the NCN proposal is performed by lead agency according to its rules.

Are clinical trials with a medicinal product or a medical device in the Polish part of the project non-commercial?

- A. **Pass:** non-commercial research will be performed
(no justification needed)
- B. **Fail:** commercial research will be performed
(justification needed, at least 1000 characters with spaces)