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# Introduction

 The Methodology for the Performance of Expertise of the Project Proposal, Interim/Final Scientific Report (hereinafter referred to as the “Methodology”) has been developed in accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation of 4 September 2018 No 560 "Procedures for the Implementation of State Research Programme Projects" (hereinafter referred to as the “Cabinet Regulations”) and in accordance with the State Research Programme approved "Innovation Fund – Sectoral Research Programme" Implementation and Supervision Commission 2022. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ procedure (hereinafter referred to as the “Procedure”) of the State Research Programme "Innovation Fund – Sectoral Research Programme" project proposal on the open call (hereinafter referred to as the “call”).

 The Methodology is designed for independent scientific experts (hereinafter referred to as the “expert”) from abroad who carry out the assessment of the project proposal, the interim scientific report and the final scientific report of the project by preparing an individual expert evaluation of the project proposal/interim scientific report/final scientific report of the project and a consolidated expert evaluation of the project proposal/interim scientific report/final scientific report of the project.

According to Section 35(1) of the Law on Scientific Activity, State research programmes are State commissions to carry out scientific research in a specific economic, educational, cultural or other sector of state priority to the State with the purpose of promoting the development of such sector.

The Methodology for the Performance of Expertise of the Project Proposal, Interim/Final Scientific Report (hereinafter referred to as the “Methodology”) has been developed in accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation of 4 September 2018 No 560 "Procedures for the Implementation of State Research Programme Projects" (hereinafter referred to as the “Cabinet Regulations”) and in accordance with the State Research Programme approved "Innovation Fund – Sectoral Research Programme" Implementation and Supervision Commission 2022. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ procedure (hereinafter referred to as the “Procedure”) of the State Research Programme "Innovation Fund – Sectoral Research Programme" project proposal on the open call (hereinafter referred to as the “call”).

According to Section 35(1) of the Law on Scientific Activity, State research programmes are State commissions to carry out scientific research in a specific economic, educational, cultural or other sector of state priority to the State with the purpose of promoting the development of such sector.

As a public agreement, the Programme is a policy implementation mechanism that identifies and researches issues of importance for Latvia's sustainability and development, which require strengthening scientific capacity (including the involvement of young scientists and students) and promoting the development of the knowledge base by focusing the work of Latvian scientific institutions. In accordance of the above, the Programme creates favourable conditions for achieving Latvia's sustainable development goals.

The Programme will attract and bring together the strongest scientific teams, in which the best scientists from the fields of Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Biopharmaceuticals and Biotechnologies and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems of the Smart Specialisation Strategy (hereinafter referred to as the “RIS3”) will cooperate to achieve the project's goal.

The Programme is created and financed by the Ministry of Economy. The total amount of public funding available for the call under the Programme is 11 400 000 *euro* (eleven million four hundred thousand euro).

The Programme's overarching objective is the long-term development of new knowledge, products and technology solutions based on a mission-oriented approach in Latvia's approved RIS3 areas "Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy" and "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems".

The long-term mission-oriented goal of the Programme is to promote scientific research and foster technology transfer, innovation and commercialisation of products and technologies, in accordance with industry demand in the RIS3 areas of "Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy" and "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems".

The tasks set for the achievement of the long-term mission-oriented goal of the Programme in accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers' Order No 285 of 26 April 2022 "On the State Research Programme "Innovation Fund – Sectoral Research Programme"" (hereinafter referred to as the “Cabinet Order”), Paragraph 6:

1. RIS3 area “Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy” – Improving access to therapies to increase survival and productivity by developing technologies for the production of medicines, their transporters and vaccines, drug reprofiling and new drug discovery and development research, identifying new biomarkers and developing precision medicine solutions;

2. RIS3 area "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems" – developing smart optics and materials, microfluidics, microelectronics and sensors, robotics and the future Internet of Things solutions.

In accordance with the above objectives, one project per objective will be funded.

The project must ensure that the horizontal objectives listed in Paragraph 7 of the Cabinet Order are met and that the results with high commercialisation potential listed in Paragraph 8 of the Cabinet Order are achieved: 1) develop new techniques and solutions; 2) develop new technologies and product prototypes.

# 1. Terms used

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Term** | **Explanation** |
| **1.** | **Scientific team** | scientific staff and scientific technical staff (persons who have the necessary technical knowledge and experience in one or more fields and who, under the supervision of scientists, participate in scientific activities by carrying out technical tasks. Scientific technical staff includes engineers, technicians, laboratory technicians, technologists, operators involved in the implementation of the project. A scientific team shall be composed of a project leader, lead participants of the project (if required), and participants of the project. |
| **2.** | **Scientific staff** | Principal investigators, researchers, research assistants, academic staff[[1]](#footnote-1) and students (including researchers, students, PhD candidates and young scientists from abroad and the diaspora). |
| **3.** | **Project applicant** | the project proposer is a scientific institution (hereinafter referred to as the “scientific institution”) registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia (entity governed by public or private law) or a higher education institution and meets the definition of a research and knowledge distribution organization[[2]](#footnote-2). The proposer is responsible for the implementation of the project and the achievement of the overall project results |
| **4.** | **Cooperation partner of the project – scientific institution** | the cooperation partner of the project is a scientific institution registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia and meeting the definition of a research and knowledge distribution organisation, participating in the project with its own staff or research infrastructure |
| **5.** | **Cooperation partner of the project – public institution** | a State institution which is required to carry out scientific activities by an external legal act, its procedure or its articles of association engages in the implementation of the project with property, intellectual property, funding or human resources in its possession or ownership |
| **6.** | **Project leader** | The scientist who submits the project proposal, manages the project, ensures its implementation: plans and supervises the fulfilment of the project tasks, is responsible for their own activities and the activities of other persons involved in the project in conformity with the tasks set for the project and rules of scientific ethics, ensures timely drafting and submission of the documentation reporting on the progress of the project in accordance with the procedures laid down in Cabinet Regulation |
| **7.** | **Lead participant of the project** | a scientist who implements the project or sub-project and is responsible for the implementation of its parts |
| **8.** | **Project participant** | a member of a scientific team who fulfils separate scientific tasks in the project implementation and is responsible for the implementation of its parts |
| **9.** | **Student at university** | a student involved in the project research group is a student of the bachelor degree study programmes; student of the vocational study programmes; student of the master’s degree study programmes (master’s programme students); residents in medicine; doctoral students.[[3]](#footnote-3). Students and PhD candidates of the university, must be involved in the project in accordance with the provisions of Paragraphs 21, 22, 23 and 24 of the Procedure |
| **10.** | **The responsible contact person of the proposer in the project (hereinafter referred to as “project contact person”)** | a natural person who has registered in the State Research Information System (hereinafter referred to as the “Information System”) completes information about the project proposal, uploads its annexes and, if necessary, maintains contacts with the staff of the Latvian Science Council (the project leader may also be the project contact person) during the project submission. The project proposer shall indicate the project contact person in Chapter 1 “General Provisions” of Part A of the project proposal. If the project has cooperation partners, their contact persons shall also be indicated. |
| **11.** | **Expert** | a scientist who performs the individual assessment of the project proposal, interim scientific report of the project and final scientific report of the project and the scientific qualification, evaluation expertise and work experience are relevant to the scientific discipline and subject matter of the project proposal, interim/final scientific report.  |
| **12.** | **Project results** | The scientific results of the project according to Paragraph 12 of the Cabinet Regulation and the deliverables according to Paragraph 8 of the Cabinet Order. |

# 2. Scientific Expertise of the Project Proposal

1. The scientific evaluation process for all project proposals submitted under the call is organised by the Latvian Science Council (hereinafter referred to as the “Council”).

2. If the project proposal fulfils the criteria for administrative evaluation, the Council shall, on the basis of Paragraph 35 of the Procedure, appoint two or more suitably qualified experts to carry out the scientific examination of the project proposal.

3. Prior to obtaining access to the project proposal in the Information System, the expert must:

3.1 confirm that they are in no conflict of interest and that they undertake to conform to the confidentiality requirements by signing and sending to the Council, by electronic mail, Annex 5 “Certification on the Absence of Conflict of Interest and Commitment to Respect Confidentiality” of the Procedure (hereinafter referred to as the “expert certification”);

3.2 enter into an agreement with the Council – Annex 6 “Agreement of Scientific Evaluation” (hereinafter – expertise agreement) to the Procedure.

4. After receiving the expert statement, and concluding the expertise agreement, the Council provides the expert with access to the project proposal and all the information in the Information System necessary to perform an appropriate assessment of the project proposal.

5. The expert must perform the scientific evaluation of the project by using their professional qualifications and experience in the relevant science field, and by providing a scientific justification for their opinion.

6. During the expert examination, the expert must cooperate with the Council and observe the instructions given by the Council in relation to the performance of the expertise in accordance with the Procedure and the expertise agreement.

7. According to Paragraph 41 of the Procedure, the is entitled to evaluate only 15 pages of the project proposal, in addition examining up to three pages if certifications of social partners, recommendation letters on cooperation on other documents are enclosed.

## 2.1. Individual Evaluation of the Project Proposal

8. The individual evaluation of the project proposal (hereinafter referred to as the “individual evaluation”), made in accordance with Annex 8 “Form of the Individual/Consolidated Expert Evaluation of the Project Proposal” to the Procedure, shall be completed and approved by the expert in the Information System within two calendar weeks from the date of conclusion of the expertise agreement and receipt of access to the project proposal and all necessary information, unless a different deadline is specified in the expert agreement.

9. The expert shall assess each criterion in the individual evaluation and provide evaluation in points, taking into account the considerations specified in the Paragraph 13 of the Methodology.

10. The expert assesses the criteria and assigns a score from 1 to 5 for each criterion, where:

10.1 Excellent – 5 points (excellent project proposal which conforms to the highest requirements of the relevant science sector or even exceeds the requirements for the criterion, any deficiency in the project proposal is insignificant);

10.2 Good – 4 points (good project proposal which conforms to the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion; however, there are certain deficiencies);

10.3 Satisfactory – 3 points (satisfactory project proposal which in general conforms to the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion, there are certain deficiencies which will hinder the project implementation and achievement of high results);

10.4 Poor – 2 points (poor project proposal, partial or only general conformity with the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion, presence of deficiencies which hinder successful implementation of the project and achievement of objectives);

10.5 Unsatisfactory – 1 point (unsatisfactory project proposal which does not conform to the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion and the provided information is insufficient for providing assessment for the criterion and also there are significant deficiencies which cast doubt over the implementation of the project and achievement of objectives);

10.6 if the evaluation of the project proposal for the relevant criterion exceeds the requirements of the previous lowest score evaluation, but does not fully meet the requirements of the next highest score evaluation, the evaluation may be expressed by awarding half a point, i.e. 0.5.

11. The expert provides a reasoned explanation for the score of each scientific criterion. The expert shall support the score given in explanation, using his/her professional qualifications and experience in the relevant scientific field.

12. Within three calendar days from the date of receipt of the individual evaluation, the Council shall assess the compliance of the individual evaluation with the considerations referred to in Paragraphs 27, 28 and 29 of the Cabinet Regulations, as well as with the methodology, if necessary, shall return the individual evaluation to the expert for clarification/revision/improvement, in such case providing justified reasons for the return. In case of such return, the expert shall, within three working days from the date of receipt of the notification of the Council via electronic mail in relation to the return of the evaluation which was sent via electronic mail, revise, redraft and approve the individual evaluation in the Information System.

13. The expert shall complete the individual evaluation in the Information System (see Annex 8 “Form of the Individual/Consolidated Expert Evaluation of the Project Proposal” to the Procedure) in accordance with the following criteria and considerations:

|  |
| --- |
| **Individual/consolidated evaluation of the project proposal** |
| Project name:Expert(s): |
| **1.** | **Criterion: Scientific quality of the project** | Maximum score 5 points |
| **1.1.** | Considerations: scientific quality, credibility, and novelty of the research | *The expert shall justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion.* *1. Information specific to the criterion is provided in Chapter 1 “Scientific Excellence”, Subchapter 2.4 “Scientific Results of the Project and Ensuring of Availability”, and Subchapter 3.1 “Project Proposer and Scientific Team” of description of the project proposal but, evaluating the criterion,* ***the project proposal must be taken into account as a whole.*** *2.* *The expert assesses the project idea and concept for the development of a new or improved technology, an innovative solution or technique, or a product prototype, its novelty and originality, and its added value,**relevance to the priority research area. The research strategy and methodological approaches chosen, the ability to generate new knowledge and technologies, should be assessed. The expert assesses whether the proposed activities are appropriate to achieve the project's results. The expert assesses, on the basis of the information contained in the project proposal, whether the research organisations involved in the implementation of the project bring together research groups relevant to the specific RIS3 area and their capacity to work together to achieve the project's overarching goal and objectives, including in relation to the reach of the objective of the Cabinet Order. The expert assesses the involvement of the project’s cooperation partners (if any) and its relevance to the implementation of the project;**3. The assessment shall take into account the thematic and horizontal objectives of the Programme, the results and their implementability, and shall assess whether the project proposal is adequate to achieve the overarching objective and objectives of the Programme, also taking into account the chosen priority research area;* *4. Assess the overall potential of the project to develop the knowledge base in the project areas in order to lay the foundations for technological development and innovation.**5. If the project is submitted together with several sub-projects, the expert assesses separately the added value and contribution of each sub-project to the overall objective and goals of the project, including in relation to the objective of the Cabinet Order, as well as the idea and concept of the sub-project to produce results with high commercialisation potential, as defined in the Cabinet Order (new techniques and solutions developed; new technologies and product prototypes developed.).* |
| **1.2.** | Considerations: scientific quality of the chosen research strategy and methodological approaches, and their relevance to the objectives |
| **1.3.** | Considerations: ability to create new knowledge or technological findings |
| **1.4.** | Considerations: contribution of partners (if any), their scientific capacity, planned cooperation quality. |
| **2.** | **Criterion: Impact of project results** | Maximum score 5 points |
| **2.1.** | Considerations: expected transfer of the knowledge and skills acquired in further activities, and the development of scientific capacity | *The expert shall justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion.* *1. Information specific to the criterion is provided in Chapter 2 ‘Impact’ of description of the project proposal but, in evaluating the criterion, the project proposal must be taken into account as a whole.* *2. Results and their expected impact, including the planned transfer of results in further activities and development of scientific capacity, possibilities for further development in research is evaluated in accordance with the specific nature of the science sector or sectors and the specific features of the project and the project proposer, and partners of the project (if any) and the specific objectives of the programme.* *3. The expert shall assess the project strategy for enhancing the impact of a new or improved technology, innovative solution or technique, or product prototype in the RIS3 area "Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy" or "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems". In addition, where relevant, the expert shall assess the strategy for securing the intellectual property. The expert assesses the potential for economic exploitation of the intellectual property generated by the planned project.* *The expert assesses whether the project is duplicative of existing technologies and solutions already available on the market.* *4. The expert assesses the impact of the project on the research community by developing the necessary research resources. Assess how effectively students and young scientists are involved in the project, including an assessment of the plan for student involvement and capacity building of the research team within the project.* *5. Sustainability of the project results is evaluated in combination with the intended scientific publications, and the distribution of project results to the scientific community. Information on the distribution of the project results can be found in the project proposal description, subsection 2.4 "Scientific results of the project and ensuring of availability thereof". Particular attention should be paid to ensuring the sustainability of results by providing data as a result of research and experimentation. The expert is also assessing the project's plans to apply to other EU-level calls for research projects, thus continuing the work started in the project.* *6. The expert takes into account the potential of the project to raise public awareness of the project results and to ensure knowledge transfer and raise awareness of the role and contribution of research to society, including through the production of informative popular science articles on the research carried out, its results and societal benefits (in Subchapter 2.3 of the project proposal).* |
| **2.2.** | Considerations: possibilities for developing research, including contributions to drafting new projects for submission to the calls for projects of the European Union Framework Programme for Research and Innovation and other research and innovation support programmes and technology initiatives |
| **2.3.** | Considerations: programmes for the achievement of objectives, knowledge important for the sectoral, economic and societal development, or policy recommendations and solutions will be created as a result of the research |
| **2.4.** | Considerations: sustainability of the acquired knowledge and a qualitative plan for its distribution, including the planned scientific publications, and informing of the public |
| **2.5.** | Considerations: the research promotes the strengthening of the scientific capacity of the scientific staff involved in the research, including students |
| **3.** | **Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and assurance** | Maximum score 5 points |
| **3.1.** | Considerations: quality of the research plan and its conformity to the objective set. The planned resources are adequate and sufficient for the achievement of the objective. It is planned to ensure efficient use of resources as part of the research. The planned work stages and tasks are clearly defined, appropriate, and credible | *The expert shall justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion.* *1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Chapter 3 “Implementation” of description of the project and Part C “Curriculum Vitae” of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion, the project proposal shall be taken into account as a whole.* *2. The implementation possibilities of the project, including the prepared plan for the research, planned project management and quality management, planned resources, available infrastructure are evaluated in accordance with the specific nature of the science sector or sectors, and the specific nature of the project, the project proposer and project cooperation partners (if any).* *3. The expert evaluates the compliance of the scientific qualifications and experience of the project leader and lead project participants with the project objectives and planned tasks, on the basis of the curriculum vitae submitted in Part C “Curriculum Vitae’” of the project proposal (it may only be submitted by the project leader or leading participant).* *The planned project is evaluated in combination with the submitted Chapter 3 “Project Budget” of Part A “General Provisions” of the project proposal, which states the costs of remunerating the project scientific team, material supplies and technical provisions, missions and publishing activities.* *Please note that the project implementation period is 24 months, and one project funding period is no less than 10 months.* |
| **3.2** | Considerations: scientific qualifications of the project leader and lead project participants on the basis of the submitted curricula vitae (CV) |
| **3.3** | Considerations: project quality management is foreseen. Organisation of management enables tracking the course of the research. Potential risks have been assessed and a plan for their prevention or the minimisation of their negative impact has been developed |
| **3.4** | Considerations: existence of the research infrastructure needed to carry out the study and access to other research infrastructure of the cooperation partners (if applicable) |
| **3.5** | Considerations: the institution carrying out the research and its cooperation partners (if applicable) have the necessary experience for project implementation |

14. The consolidated expert evaluation of a project proposal is an agreement between all the experts on the final evaluation of the project proposal, so the expert who drafts the consolidated evaluation of a project proposal consults the other experts on:

14.1 the scores for each criterion;

14.2 a justification for the scores for each criterion, compiled from the justifications provided by all the experts in their individual evaluations.

15. Within three working days, the Council assesses the compliance of the consolidated evaluation with the Methodology and approves it in the Information System. If the consolidated evaluation is not in line with the Methodology or does not provide a fully reasoned justification for the evaluation given in relation to the weaknesses and deficiencies identified in the project proposal, it shall be returned to the expert responsible for consolidating all individual evaluations for clarification/improvement.

16. The expert responsible for consolidating all individual evaluations shall, in the event of a return of the consolidated evaluation of the project proposal, clarify/improve the consolidated evaluation of the project proposal in the Information System within three working days of the date of receipt of the return notification by e-mail and submit it to the Council for approval in the Information System, after prior agreement with the other experts in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Methodology. If the experts are unable to agree on a consolidated evaluation due to different views, the experts shall inform the Council, and the Council shall engage another expert in accordance with Paragraph 40 of the Procedure.

# 3. Scientific Expertise of the Interim and Final Scientific Report of the Project

17. Within one month of the interim of the project, i.e.12 months after the start of the project, the proposer completes and submits an interim scientific report (hereinafter referred to as the “interim report”), and within one month after the end of the project, the proposer completes and files a final scientific report (hereinafter referred to as the “final report”). For the interim and final reports (hereinafter referred to as the “interim and/or final report”), the Council shall provide scientific expertise by at least two experts.

18. The Council must provide each expert with access to the interim or final report of the project, and the corresponding project proposal. If the final report is evaluated, the Council must additionally provide the expert with access to the interim report of the same project. Prior to receiving access to the reports in the Information System, the expert shall confirm that he/she has no conflict of interest and shall undertake to conform to the confidentiality requirements by signing and sending the expert certification via e-mail to the Council

## 3.1 Individual Evaluation of the Interim and Final Scientific Report of the Project

19. Within two weeks of the date of conclusion of the expertise agreement with the Council, the expert shall make individual evaluation of theinterimscientific report or the final scientific report (hereinafter referred to as the “interim/final scientific report”) by completing and confirming Annex 10 “Form of the Individual/Consolidated Evaluation of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report” to the Procedure in the Information System.

20. The expert shall provide one of the following two types of evaluation for the project interim scientific report:

20.1 to continue the project;

20.2 not to continue the project.

21. The expert provides one of the following scientific evaluations for the final scientific report:

21.1 the project goal has been achieved;

21.2 the project goal has not been achieved.

22. The expert evaluates the interim/final scientific report according to the following criteria:

|  |
| --- |
| **Individual/Consolidated Evaluation of the Interim/Final Scientific Report of the Project** |
| Project name:Expert(s): |
| **1.** | **Criterion: Scientific quality of the project** |
| *The expert assesses how the scientific team of the project has achieved the objectives laid down in the project proposal by the interim/final of the project. The basis here is Chapter 1 “Scientific Excellence” of the interim/final scientific report, also taking into account the interim/final scientific report as a whole, as well as the project proposal. Here, the expert provides comments and suggestions to fully achieve the project's objective and perform the tasks to the highest scientific quality, or on research opportunities after the end of the project in order to achieve scientific excellence. The comments shall take into account the programme's mission, horizontal objectives and results, and assess whether the project is progressing towards the reach of programme's main objectives and objectives.**The expert shall assess whether the results of the project’s scientific team during the relevant period demonstrate its high research capacity and whether the results described adequately develop the knowledge base in the RIS3 areas of "Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy" or "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems" to address societal challenges.* |
| **2.** | **Criterion: Impact of project results** |
| *The expert assesses how the scientific team of the project has achieved the objectives laid down in the project proposal by the interim/final of the project. The basis here is Chapter 2 “Impact” of the interim/final scientific report, also taking into account the interim/final scientific report as a whole, as well as the project proposal. In this section, the expert provides comments, suggestions and recommendations to better achieve the intended impact and ensure the distribution of the knowledge gained to the scientific community and communication to society at large, or for activities beyond the end of the project.* *The following considerations should be taken into account in the evaluation: 1. the impact of the results achieved, including the implementation of the planned transfer of results into further activities and scientific capacity development, and the opportunities for further research development; 2. the implementation of the project plan to increase the impact of a new or improved technology, innovative solution or product prototype in the RIS3 area "Biomedicine, Medical Technologies, Pharmacy" or "Photonics and Smart Materials, Technologies and Engineering Systems"; 3. the impact of the project on the research community by developing the resources needed for research. How effectively students and young scientists are involved in the project, including the implementation of the plan for student involvement and capacity building of the research team within the project; 4. The sustainability of the project results in relation to the foreseen scientific publications and the distribution of the project results to the scientific community, in particular the accumulation of data resulting from research and experimental development. Plan for proposing of project for other EU-level calls for research projects; 5. The potential of the project to raise public awareness of the project results and to ensure knowledge transfer and raise awareness of the role and contribution of research to society, including through the production of informative popular science articles on the research carried out, its results and societal benefits, including the implementation of the plant set out in the project proposal.* |
| **3.** | **Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and assurance** |
| *The expert assesses how the scientific team of the project has achieved the objectives laid down in the project proposal by the interim/final of the project. The basis here is Chapter 3 “Implementation” of the project interim/final scientific report, also taking into account the project interim/final scientific report and project proposal as a whole. In this section, the expert provides comments and suggestions for adjustments to the work plan or research opportunities after the end of the project.**The expert evaluates whether the project management was successful, also taking into account the overall progress of the project. It shall be also evaluated whether the risk plan provided for in Subchapter 3.3 “Project Management and Risk Plan” of the project proposal has been achieved in cases where the risks materialised and whether the solutions thereof were credible.**In addition, the expert assesses and indicates whether the project has sufficiently involved students and PhD candidates by the specified stage, and assesses the involvement of Latvian diaspora researchers and university students in the project.* |

## 3.2 Consolidated Evaluation of the Interim and Final Scientific Report of the Project

23. Once all the experts carrying out the scientific expertise for the interim/final scientific report have completed and submitted each of their project interim/project final individual evaluation of the scientific report in the information system, the Council shall provide all experts with access to the individual evaluation completed by the other experts and shall disclose to each expert the identity of the other experts.

 24. One of the experts shall complete the consolidated interim/final scientific report evaluation in the Information System in accordance with Annex 10 to the Procedure “Form of the Individual/Consolidated Evaluation of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report” under the conditions set out in Paragraphs 23 to 26 of the Methodology, all the experts shall, by mutual agreement, approve the draft consolidated evaluation of the interim/final scientific report in the Information System within one calendar week of its submission by one expert to the other experts in the Information System.

25. In the consolidated evaluation of the interim/final report, the experts agree on a single score for the interim/final scientific report in accordance with Paragraphs 23 to 26 of the Methodology, summarisingthe comments made in the individual evaluations of the interim/final report.

## 3.3 Evaluation of the Objective of the Final Scientific Report

 26. In the consolidated valuation of the final report, the two experts agree on a consolidated valuation in percentages, which has the following meaning:

Compliant – overall percentage score is 85%-100% and above. The evaluation is given if the project has been carried out with good or excellent scientific quality and has met or exceeded the expected objectives and scientific outputs. Where there are non-achievement or other minor shortcomings, but the existing scientific results are of good scientific quality, e.g. the scientific articles are published in high quality journals, so that these shortcomings have not affected the achievement of the objective. If the interim scientific quality assessment of the project makes recommendations for the further implementation of the project, they are taken into account or a reasoned justification is given for not taking them into account.

Partially compliant – overall percentage score is 25%-84%. The evaluation is given if the project has been carried out with sufficient scientific merit, the planned results of the project have been partially achieved, which has affected the overall achievement of the project objectives. If the interim scientific quality assessment of the project makes recommendations for the further implementation of the project, they have been taken into account partially or not at all, and the reasons for not taking them into account are not sufficiently substantiated.

Not compliant – the overall percentage score is 0%-24%. A evaluation is given if the project has been carried out with insufficient scientific quality, the planned results have been partially or not completely achieved, and the overall objective of the project has therefore not been achieved or has been achieved to an insufficient extent. If the interim scientific quality assessment of the project makes recommendations for the further implementation of the project, they are not taken into account or a reasoned justification is not given for not taking them into account.

 27. In accordance with Paragraph 21 of the Methodology, the Council shall calculate the reimbursable part of the funding as follows:

 27.1 if the percentage of the Experts' objective score referred to in subparagraph 2.20 of the Agreement is 60% to 65%, a flat rate of 5% shall apply;

 27.2 if the percentage of the Experts' objective score referred to in subparagraph 2.20 of the Agreement is 50% to 59%, a flat rate of 10% shall apply;

 27.3 if the percentage of the Experts' target score referred to in Subparagraph 2.20 of the Agreement is below 50%, a flat rate of 25% shall apply.

1. Law on Higher Education Institutions Section 27(1) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Commission Regulation (EU) No [651/2014](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/651/oj/?locale=LV) of 17 June 2014 (26.6.2014 Official Journal of the European Union | L 187/1) declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Sections 107 and 108 of the Treaty Section 2 Paragraph 83 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/651/oj/?locale=LV>) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Law on Higher Education Institutions Section 44(1) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)