

Annex 1 to  
Order No 4/2022  
of 24 January 2022  
by the Director of the National Science Centre  
amending the proposal evaluation procedure for  
the MINIATURA call

### **§1.**

This Order lays down the detailed proposal evaluation procedure for the Expert Teams under the MINIATURA 6 call.

### **§ 2.**

Whenever this Order refers to:

1. Council, it shall mean the Council of the National Science Centre;
2. Director, it shall mean the Director of the National Science Centre;
3. Coordinator, it shall mean a person employed as a Scientific Coordinator by the National Science Centre,
4. Expert, it shall mean an Expert Team member and
5. Ranking List, it shall mean a ranking list of proposals submitted in a given month and recommended for funding.

### **§ 3. Coordinators**

The duties of the Coordinators shall include:

1. running eligibility checks on proposals;
2. naming Experts to draft individual reviews;
3. referring proposals for merit-based evaluation;
4. assessing the accuracy and impartiality of individual reviews drafted by the Experts and
5. providing the Director with the Ranking Lists for his approval.

### **§ 4. Experts**

The duties of the Experts shall include drafting individual reviews of proposals assigned by the Coordinator.

### **§ 5. Evaluation of proposals**

1. Proposals shall be subject to an eligibility check and merit-based evaluation.
2. The eligibility check shall be carried out by the Coordinators.
3. The merit-based evaluation shall be conducted by the Experts.
4. Only proposals approved as eligible by the Coordinator shall be accepted for the merit-based evaluation.
5. Proposals shall undergo a single-stage merit-based evaluation.

6. The merit-based evaluation of proposals shall consist in individual reviews drafted by three Experts working independently in accordance with the criteria established for the MINIATURA call by the Council.
7. The merit-based evaluation shall be performed based on the information specified in the proposal.
8. Experts may reject a proposal as ineligible at the stage of the merit-based evaluation.
9. A proposal shall not be recommended for funding if it has been given the score of “no” by at least two Experts, in the same criterion subject to evaluation. The foregoing does not apply to the ethics issues or data management criteria.
10. A proposal shall be recommended for funding if it meets all of the following conditions:
  - 1) it has been given the score of “yes” by at least two Experts evaluating the proposal in each criterion below:
    - a) Does the research planned by a person carrying out a research activity meet the criterion of basic research?
    - b) Does the research activity meet the other requirements of the call announcement?
    - c) Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?
    - d) Is the estimated cost of a research activity reasonable?
  - 2) its final grade has attained a minimum of 70% of points for the following criteria:
    - a) evaluation of scientific achievements of a person carrying out a research activity;
    - b) merit-based evaluation of a research activity and justification of its completion in view of the future research project,
  - 3) it has been within the pool available funding allocated for a given month.
11. Proposals that have been given the same final score-based evaluation may be recommended for funding only if they all are within the pool of available funding allocated by the NCN Council for a given month.

## **§ 6. Ranking Lists**

1. The Coordinators shall establish Ranking Lists on the basis of the list of proposals recommended for funding.
2. The Coordinator shall provide the Director with the Ranking Lists for his approval.