



VII. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for research projects carried out in international cooperation – HARMONIA

▪ **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?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 project meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?¹**

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

A. A. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (WEIGHTING 40%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF PLANNED RESEARCH OR PROJECT TASKS (WEIGHTING 30%)

- 5 Excellent, the project results are likely to be published in academic press/journals of the highest global 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 specialist academic press/journals.
- 2 Average, the results might be published in academic press/ journals of the low scientific importance.

¹ Question applies at the first stage of the merit-based evaluation.

² Basic research is experimental or theoretical endeavours undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use (art. 2(3)(a) of the act of 30 April 2010 on the principles of funding science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 87).



1 Poor, there is little chance of publishing the results.

0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND ITS IMPACT (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/the project has been submitted to the wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE RESEARCH TEAM (WEIGHTING 40%)

B.1. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 20%)

▪ **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 their particular field.

4 Very good, the Principal Investigator is an internationally recognised expert in their particular 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.
- **Evaluation 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 academic press/journals of the highest rank 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 national academic press/journals.
 - 1 The results of the completed projects have been published in local academic press/journals.
 - 0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

B.2. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE LEADING RESEARCH PARTNER FROM A FOREIGN INSTITUTION/ EVALUATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR RESULTING FROM INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (WEIGHTING 20%)

Case I³

- **scientific achievements of the leading research partner from a foreign institution within the research field specified in the proposal**

³ In the case of research projects carried out as international cooperation under a direct agreement with a partner or partners representing foreign research institutions, as well as projects carried out as bi-lateral or multi-lateral international programmes and initiatives.



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

Case II⁴

- **the scientific achievements resulting from international cooperation and their relevance to the scope of research planned in the proposal. In the event of new cooperation, the mark for the Principal Investigator should be applied in this section**

- 5 Outstanding: the results have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
- 4 Very good: the results have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank in a given field of research.
- 3 Good: the results have been published in international specialist academic press/journals.
- 2 Moderate: the results have been published in national academic press/journals.
- 1 Modest: the results have been published in local academic press/journals.
- 0 The results 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 and research team's qualifications, research facilities etc.:

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

Justification:

⁴ In the case of research projects whereby Polish teams use using large-scale international research infrastructure.



D. EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION 10%

- **significance of international cooperation for the completion of the research project:**

- 3** International cooperation is indispensable for the full implementation of the project and will significantly increase its substantive value and help to facilitate/accelerate research.
- 2** International cooperation is advisable in order to raise the scientific level of the proposed research and facilitate/accelerate the implementation of the project.
- 1** International cooperation is advisable in order to raise the scientific level of the proposed research.
- 0** The impact of the proposed cooperation on the implementation of the project has not been demonstrated or the planned research does not require international cooperation.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regards to the subject and scope of the research?⁴**

- yes
- no

In the case of "no" please justify

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal: