Excerpt from: 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 90/2019 of 12 September 2019

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE CALLS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

V. Proposal evaluation criteria in the SONATA call

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

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

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

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

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

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**[1]

- yes
- no

In the case of „no", please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues been duly addressed?**

- yes
- no
- does not apply

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.

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

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

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/ the project has been submitted to the wrong review panel.

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?**[3]

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

- **Data management has been:**

- duly planned
- unduly planned
- does not apply
In the case of "no", please justify:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

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