



§ 1.

Whenever this Order refers to:

- 1) NCN, it shall mean the National Science Centre;
- 2) Council, it shall mean the Council of the National Science Centre;
- 3) Director, it shall mean the Director of the National Science Centre;
- 4) Donor Programme Partner, it shall mean the agencies responsible for supporting the Program Operator, i.e., the Research Council of Norway (RCN) and the Icelandic Centre for Research (Rannis);
- 5) Donor States, it shall mean Iceland, the Principality of Liechtenstein, and the Kingdom of Norway;
- 6) Coordinator, it shall mean the scientific coordinator referred to in Article 2(5) of the Act on the National Science Centre of 30 April 2010 (uniform text in Journal of Laws 2026, item 101, hereinafter referred to as the “Act”);
- 7) Expert Team (hereinafter also referred to as the “Panel”), it shall mean individual international experts appointed in one of three main research domains, i.e. HS, ST and NZ to evaluate proposals submitted to GRIEG BIS. The Expert Team shall participate in the individual evaluation, consensus stage and panel stage of the evaluation procedure;
- 8) Cooperation Committee, it shall mean a body composed of representatives of the Programme Operator and the Donor Programme Partners. The Cooperation Committee is responsible for advising on call preparation, programme implementation and approvment of the composition of the Selection Committee;
- 9) Selection Committee, it shall mean a body composed of international experts possessing the relevant expertise and approved by the Cooperation Committee. The Selection Committee is responsible for preparing the final ranking list of proposals recommended for financing;
- 10) Chair, it shall mean an Expert Team and Selection Committee member appointed by the Council to manage the work of the Expert Team;
- 11) Expert, it shall mean an Expert Team member participating in the merit-based evaluation;
- 12) Rapporteur, it shall mean an expert appointed by Coordinator from among the three assigned proposal evaluators, responsible for drafting the consensus report and presenting it during the panel meeting;



- 13) Proposal, it shall mean a Proposal submitted in response to the GRIEG BIS call launched by the National Science Centre;
- 14) Interdisciplinary Proposal, it shall mean a proposal which contains at least one auxiliary NCN Review Panel other than the one to which the proposal was submitted and which has been identified by the Chair as requiring an additional individual review;
- 15) Meeting, it shall mean a single day in an Expert Team's or Selection Committee's session;
- 16) Ranking List, it shall mean the Ranking List of Proposals evaluated under the GRIEG BIS evaluation procedure, ranked according to the final scores awarded following the individual evaluation, consensus stage, panel stage and any additional points awarded by the Selection Committee, with an indication of proposals recommended for funding and proposals placed on the Reserve List;
- 17) Reserve List, it shall mean the list of Proposals that have successfully passed the evaluation procedure and met all evaluation thresholds, but which fall outside the limit of available funds allocated for the GRIEG BIS call, ranked according to the final scores awarded;
- 18) Project Promoter (Applicant), it shall mean the Polish research organisation acting on behalf of the Project Partnership and submitting a proposal under the GRIEG BIS call, which has scientific and administrative responsibility for the project;
- 19) Principal Investigator, it shall mean the researcher designated by the Project Promoter to provide the scientific leadership of the project and responsible for its scientific implementation;
- 20) Project Partnership, it shall mean the group of at least two eligible entities participating in the project, comprising at least one Polish research organization acting as the Project Promoter and at least one research organization from Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein approved, as applicable, by RCN or Rannis;
- 21) Project Partner, it shall mean an entity participating in the implementation of a GRIEG BIS project as a member of the Project Partnership.

§ 2. General Provisions

1. Members of the Expert Teams shall be selected for each scientific domain by the Council pursuant to Annex to NCN Council Resolution No 19/2026 of 12 February 2026 and shall be appointed by the NCN Director in accordance with the rules governing the selection and appointment of experts at the National Science Centre. Experts shall be selected on the basis of their high level of scientific expertise, appropriate range of competencies and experience in evaluating research project proposals. The number of Experts appointed to each Expert Team shall be determined taking into account, inter alia, the number, scope and disciplinary



distribution of the Proposals submitted for evaluation, as well as the need to ensure the efficient conduct of the evaluation procedure.

2. For the purposes of each GRIEG BIS call, Expert Teams shall be established to evaluate Proposals submitted within one of the three scientific domains, named respectively HS (Humanities, Social Sciences and Art Sciences), NZ (Life Sciences) and ST (Physical Sciences and Engineering).
3. An Expert Team shall consist of international Experts possessing expertise relevant to the Proposals under evaluation. Experts shall be affiliated with institutions located outside Poland and outside the Donor States. The composition of each Expert Team shall ensure the proper and impartial assessment of the submitted Proposals.
4. The work of an Expert Team shall be coordinated by a Chair appointed by the NCN Council from among the international Experts participating in the evaluation process. The Chair shall be responsible for overseeing the consensus stage, panel discussions and preparation of ranking recommendations.
5. During the Meetings, a Team's Chair may appoint another Expert to manage the work of the Team in their stead in case of the absence or recognized conflict of interest. Should the Team's Chair be unable to appoint such an Expert, they shall be appointed by the Coordinator.
6. Experts participating in the evaluation process shall comply with the ethical standards, confidentiality requirements and conflict-of-interest rules applicable to experts appointed by the National Science Centre and shall perform their duties impartially and independently as is described in the "Code of Ethics for Experts of the National Science Centre".
7. The Coordinator shall ensure that appropriate measures are taken to exclude an Expert from the Proposal evaluation procedure in the event of a conflict of interest or justified suspicion of a bias in the Expert's actions. An excluded Expert shall not participate in the evaluation, discussion, scoring or ranking of the relevant Proposal.
8. Experts and Selection Committee Members shall not use generative artificial intelligence tools or any external systems in the evaluation process of the Proposal.
9. Proposals submitted to GRIEG BIS shall be evaluated in English.

§ 3. Expert Teams

1. The duties of the Expert Teams shall include:
 - 1) evaluation of Proposals, including the individual Reviews;
 - 2) preparation of Consensus expert assessment following the discussion basing on the individual evaluations;



- 3) participation in the panel discussions;
- 4) establishing the ranking order of proposals based on evaluation results and formulating recommendations that serve as the basis for the Preliminary Ranking Lists prepared by the Coordinators for consideration by the Selection Committee.

§ 4. Coordinators

1. The duties of Coordinators shall include:
 - 1) performing eligibility checks of Proposals;
 - 2) assigning Experts to evaluate Proposals in cases where the Chair is excluded due to a conflict of interest or is otherwise unable to perform their duties;
 - 3) providing the Chair with the list of Proposals in which at least one auxiliary NCN Review Panel has been identified in a scientific domain other than the one to which the Proposal was submitted, i.e. HS, ST and NZ;
 - 4) naming Experts responsible to draft individual reviews in the event of the Team's Chair experiencing a conflict of interest;
 - 5) assigning an Expert to draft an individual review of Proposals in which at least one auxiliary NCN Review Panel has been identified in a scientific domain other than the one to which the Proposal was submitted, i.e. HS, ST and NZ in respect of which the Chair requested the additional individual review; Experts required to draft such reviews shall be appointed from other Expert Teams established to evaluate Proposals in the call;
 - 6) ensuring the proper organization and conduct of the evaluation process, including the individual evaluation stage, consensus stage and panel stage;
 - 7) organizing Expert Team Meetings, including:
 - a) summoning Meetings and participating in them;
 - b) verifying the conformity of the Meeting reports drawn up by the recording clerk with the actual course of the Meetings and resolutions of the Team;
 - 8) monitoring the preparation of Consensus expert assessment, Evaluation Summary Reports and Selection Committee decisions by verifying the completeness, consistency and quality of evaluation reports prepared by Experts;
 - 9) assessing the accuracy and impartiality of the reviews drafted by the Experts;
 - 10) monitoring compliance with confidentiality and conflict-of-interest requirements applicable to Experts and members of the Selection Committee;
 - 11) preparing and submitting Preliminary Ranking Lists for each scientific domain and other evaluation results described in the GRIEG BIS call documentation required by the Selection Committee;



12) presenting the Director with the Final Ranking Lists established by the Selection Committee for his approval.

2. Coordinators shall organize the Team's work and cooperate with the Team's Chair of the Expert Teams in order to ensure a fair, transparent and efficient evaluation process.

§ 5. Chair of the Expert Team

1. The Chair of the Expert Team shall be responsible for ensuring the efficient and coherent evaluation of proposals within the relevant scientific domain (HS, NZ or ST). The Chair's responsibilities shall include:
 - 1) assigning eligible proposals to international experts whose expertise most closely matches the subject and scope of the proposal;
 - 2) selecting interdisciplinary Proposals from the list of Proposals in which at least one auxiliary NCN Review Panel has been identified in a scientific domain other than the one to which the Proposal was submitted, i.e. HS, ST and NZ, for which (in well-justified cases) an additional individual review shall be drafted by an Expert from another panel; the Chair may consult their decision in this respect with the Experts drafting individual reviews;
 - 3) overseeing the consistency and quality of individual evaluations and supporting the preparation of consensus expert assessments;
 - 4) chairing the meetings of the Expert Team, including the consensus stage and the final discussion stage of the evaluation process;
 - 5) leading discussions among experts and facilitating the resolution of differing views regarding proposal assessments;
 - 6) conducting voting;
 - 7) approving the minutes from the Expert Team's Meetings;
 - 8) participating in meeting of the Selection Committee and presenting, where required, the outcomes and recommendations of the Team's evaluation;
2. The Chair of the Expert Team shall cooperate with the Coordinator throughout the evaluation process and contribute to maintaining the transparency, fairness and scientific quality of the assessment procedure.

§ 6. Experts

1. The duties of the Experts shall include:
 - 1) drafting individual reviews of Proposals assigned by the Team's Chair or Coordinator and submitting an individual evaluation report for each Proposal within the deadline specified by the Programme Operator;



- 2) drafting an additional individual review of the assigned Proposal from another scientific domain;
- 3) participating in the Consensus stage of the evaluation process, including discussing the assigned Proposals with other Experts and contributing to the preparation of consensus expert assessments;
- 4) acting as a Rapporteur for assigned Proposals, where requested by the Coordinator, including drafting and presenting the consensus expert assessment during the Panel Meeting;
- 5) participating in the Panel Meetings and contributing to discussions aimed at ensuring the consistency and quality of the evaluation process;
- 6) taking part in the Final Discussion stage of the Panel Meeting, including the review of consensus expert assessments, the assessment of score consistency and the formulation of recommendations concerning the Proposals;
- 7) contributing to the preparation of the panel report and the recommendations for Proposals to be put forward to the Selection Committee;
- 8) complying with the principles of confidentiality, impartiality and avoidance of conflicts of interest throughout the evaluation process.

§ 7. Selection Committee

1. The Selection Committee shall consist of at least five members possessing the relevant expertise and include the Chairs of the HS, NZ and ST Expert Teams. All the members with voting privileges shall be external to the Programme Operator and Donor Programme Partners. The Programme Operator and the Donor Programme Partners shall not be voting members of the Selection Committee. Financial Mechanisms Office, the embassies of the Donor States, and the National Focal Point may be members of the Selection Committee, that can participate in the meetings as observers. The duties of the Selection Committee shall include:
 - 1) discussing and awarding additional points to Proposals under the additional criteria specified in the call documentation;
 - 2) deciding on the order of equally scored Proposals in cases of the unavailable funding based on information provided in the call documentation;
 - 3) deciding on the total number of Proposals recommended for funding, taking into account the overall quality of the evaluated Proposals and the available call budget;
 - 4) deciding on modifications to Proposals recommended for funding, as indicated in consensus reports, including budget reductions or other adjustments resulting from the eligibility check of the costs;



- 5) establishing, approving and recommending the final ranking list of Proposals for funding and, where applicable, the reserve list.
2. The Selection Committee shall consider the evaluation results and recommendations submitted by the Expert Teams and award additional points pursuant to § 7. Additional Points Awarded by the Selection Committee may be as follows:
 - a. Selection Committee may award additional points to the Proposal in accordance with the criteria specified in the GRIEG BIS call documentation. The Selection Committee shall record the additional points awarded and the justification for their allocation;
 - b. Additional points awarded by the Selection Committee shall be added to the final score obtained by the Proposal following completion of the merit-based evaluation conducted by the Expert Teams and shall be taken into account when establishing the final Ranking List and, where applicable, the Reserve List;
 - c. Additional points may be awarded for:
 - a) the status of the Principal Investigator as an early-stage researcher;
 - b) the leadership of the Proposal by a female or male researcher representing an underrepresented research area, based on the statistics on gender distribution among NCN grant awardees in 2011–2025 call;
 - c) the interdisciplinary character of the Proposal, demonstrated through meaningful integration of approaches, methods or expertise originating from more than one academic discipline.
 - d. Each Proposal may receive a maximum of 0.5 additional points under each of the criteria referred to in Point 2c., with the total number of additional points awarded by the Selection Committee not exceeding 1.5 points.
3. On the basis of the final scores awarded during the merit-based evaluation and any additional points awarded by the Selection Committee, the Selection Committee shall establish, approve and recommend the final Ranking List of Proposals recommended for funding and, where applicable, the Reserve List.

§ 8. Proposal Evaluation Stages

1. Proposals shall be subject to an eligibility check and merit-based evaluation.
2. The eligibility check of Proposals shall be performed by the Coordinators.
3. The eligibility check shall comprise:
 - 1) verification of the Proposal for completeness;
 - 2) verification of whether the Proposal complies with all the requirements set out in the call documentation;



- 3) verification of the completeness of the Proposal and the presence of all required declarations, documents and attachments;
 - 4) verification of whether the expenditures outlined in the Proposal comply with the terms specified in the call documentation;
 - 5) verification of whether the Proposal has been submitted by an eligible Applicant (project Promoter);
 - 6) verification of whether the Project Partnership fulfils the eligibility requirements set out in the call documentation;
4. Only proposals that are found eligible in the course of the eligibility check shall be recommended for merit-based evaluation;
5. The merit-based evaluation of Proposals shall be carried out by the Expert Teams;
6. A Proposal may be declared ineligible at any stage of the evaluation process if it becomes evident that one or more of the eligibility requirements set out in the call documentation have not been fulfilled or have ceased to be fulfilled;
7. The merit-based evaluation of Proposals shall be carried out in the following stages:
- 1) Individual expert evaluation, consisting of:
 - a) the independent assessment of each eligible Proposal by three international Experts appointed based on their relevant expertise;
 - b) the preparation and submission by each Expert of an individual evaluation report, including scores and comments in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the call documentation.
 - 2) Consensus stage consisting of:
 - a) the discussions between Experts evaluating the Proposal;
 - b) the preparation of a consensus expert assessments reflecting the Experts' common position, including agreed scores and comments; where consensus cannot be reached, the report shall reflect the majority view and record any dissenting opinions;
 - c) the presentation of the consensus assessment by the Rapporteur appointed for the Proposal.
 - 3) Final discussion stage, consisting of:
 - a) the discussion and the review of the consensus expert assessments by the Expert Team;
 - b) the assessment of the consistency of scores and evaluations across the Proposals;



- c) the discussion of Proposals for which consensus could not be fully reached during the consensus stage, where applicable;
 - d) the verification of whether the Proposals have passed all thresholds required for recommendation to the Selection Committee;
 - e) the establishment of the Expert Team's recommendations regarding the Proposals;
 - f) the preparation of the panel report, including Evaluation Summary Reports and lists of evaluated Proposals, in accordance with the call documentation.
- 4) Final decision stage, consisting of:
- a) the consideration by the Selection Committee of the evaluation results and recommendations submitted by the Expert Teams;
 - b) the discussion and allocation of additional points under the criteria specified in the call documentation;
 - c) the establishment and approval of the final ranking list of Proposals recommended for funding and, where applicable, the reserve list;
 - d) the adoption of decisions on any modifications to Proposals recommended for funding, in accordance with the call documentation.

§9. Expert Team Meetings

1. The duration of Team Meetings should depend on the number of Proposals to be evaluated and the volume of work necessary for their evaluation.
2. On having completed all individual reviews assigned to them, the Experts shall be granted access to the evaluations prepared by the other Experts assigned to the same Proposals for the purposes of the consensus stage.
3. Team Meetings shall be held in the presence of a quorum of more than a half of the Expert Team's members.
4. Team Meetings shall be chaired by the Chair of the Expert Team or, where necessary, by an Expert designated to act on the Chair's behalf.
5. A Coordinator and a recording clerk shall participate in every Team Meeting, but shall not take part in the voting.
6. In the case of a conflict of interest, the Expert shall have to leave the meeting room. Exclusion of the Expert on the grounds of a conflict of interest shall not affect the quorum when voting.
7. The minutes shall be taken by the recording clerk and approved by the Coordinator and Chair of the Expert Team.



§10. Evaluation of Proposals at the Team Meetings

1. Eligible Proposals shall be subject to discussion during Team Meetings on the basis of the individual evaluations and consensus expert assessments prepared by the Expert Team Members.
2. The Expert Team shall assess Proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria, scoring rules and thresholds specified in the call documentation.
3. Proposals that do not fulfil the requirements set out in the call documentation shall not be recommended for funding.
4. The merit-based assessment of a Proposal shall be based on the individual Experts' evaluations, the consensus expert assessments and the Panel.
5. Individual reviews shall not be binding upon the Team and shall be treated merely as a point of departure in the preparation of the consensus expert assessments and the subsequent discussion of the Proposal.
6. During the Consensus stage, the Experts assigned to a Proposal shall discuss their individual evaluations and agree on scores and comments to be included in the consensus assessment. In the situation, where the consensus cannot be reached, the report shall reflect the majority view and record any dissenting opinions.
7. During the final discussion stage, the Team shall review consensus assessments, assess the consistency of scores and evaluations, and discuss Proposals, if necessary.
8. The Expert Team shall verify whether each Proposal has passed all evaluation thresholds specified in the call documentation.
9. Basing on the discussion, the Expert Team shall establish recommendations regarding the evaluated Proposals and prepare the panel report in accordance with the call documentation.
10. Proposals that fail to meet any of the required thresholds or receive a negative assessment under the elimination criteria shall not be recommended for further consideration by the Selection Committee.
11. Proposals that receive a negative agreed assessment under Criterion 0 related to the Relevance in relation to the objectives and priorities of the Basic Research Programme or under the Costs criterion shall not be recommended for funding.
12. A negative assessment of the Data Management Plan or Ethics Issues shall not in itself disqualify a Proposal from further evaluation.
13. The Expert Team shall assess the justification and eligibility of the proposed budget in accordance with the call documentation but shall not modify the budget of the Proposal.



14. Where the Expert Team considers that a Proposal lacks sufficient information to enable a proper assessment against the evaluation criteria, this shall be reflected in the evaluation and scoring of the Proposal.
15. During the consensus stage, the Experts assigned to a Proposal shall seek to reach a common position regarding the evaluation of the Proposal and the scores assigned to it.
16. Where consensus cannot be reached, the consensus report prepared by the Consensus Stage of evaluation, shall reflect the majority view and record any dissenting opinions.
17. If, during the Final Discussion stage, the Team cannot find a common position on the evaluation of a Proposal, it shall make the decision by way of a vote;
18. Decisions by the Team that should require a vote shall be taken by a simple majority.
19. During the final discussion stage, the Expert Team shall review the consistency of evaluations and scores across all Proposals under consideration.
20. The Expert Team shall establish recommendations concerning the evaluated Proposals and prepare a panel report in accordance with the call documentation.
21. The panel report shall include:
 - a) Evaluation Summary Reports for individual Proposals;
 - b) a list of Proposals found ineligible during evaluation;
 - c) a list of Proposals that have passed all applicable thresholds;
 - d) a list of Proposals that have failed one or more thresholds;
 - e) recommendations for Proposals to be forwarded to the Selection Committee;
 - f) any additional recommendations of the Expert Team.
22. Only Proposals that have passed all applicable thresholds and received a positive recommendation from the Expert Team may be forwarded to the Selection Committee.
23. Following completion of the Expert Team's work, the Selection Committee shall consider the evaluation results, award additional points in accordance with the call documentation and establish the final ranking list of Proposals recommended for funding and, where applicable, the reserve list. The Selection Committee should ensure the similar success rate across all scientific domains.
24. If two or more Proposals receive the same score following the evaluation by the Expert Team, the final ranking order shall be determined by the Selection Committee after the allocation of additional points under the additional criteria specified in the call documentation.
25. Proposals that meet the criteria laid down in the Call documentation and received positive recommendation of the Expert Team, but fall outside of the limit of available funds allocated by the Council for the call may be included in the Reserve List.



26. The decision of the Team on the recommendation of the proposal for funding shall not be restricted by the available call budget.
27. The Selection Committee shall not be required to distribute the whole funding available and cannot recommend for funding Proposals that exceed the available funding.

§ 11. Ranking Lists

1. The Coordinator shall present the Director with the Ranking Lists compiled by the Selection Committee.
2. If funds allocated for the call become available, the NCN Director may award funding to a proposal placed on the Reserve List referred to in § 10 (25).