

Annex No. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/ uncorrectable	form evaluation - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F1	The grant application was submitted in the prescribed form	exclusion	uncorrectable		grant application	MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the application was finalized in electronic form in the IS KP14+ application.	MS2014+ - control at the application phase automatically, other than electronically submitted grant applications are not possible
F2	In the grant application all required data is filled out	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application	MS2014+	a) Mandatory entries are automatically evaluated at the stage of finalizing the grant application. b) The evaluator will check the grant application under the conditions laid down in the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries -specific part, whether the project name is the same or includes the name or acronym of a large infrastructure of the Roadmap of Large Infrastructures for Research, Experimental Development and Innovation of the Czech Republic for the years 2016–2022.	MS2014+ - Automatic check for fields set as mandatory Evaluator: a) This criterion is met if the grant application include the name/acronym of a large infrastructure of Czech Republic's map for large infrastructures for research, experimental development and innovation for the years 2016 to 2022. This criterion is not met if the grant application does not include the name/acronym of a large infrastructure according to the Roadmap of Large Infrastructures for Research, Experimental Development and Innovation of the Czech Republic for the years 2016–2022.
F3	All required annexes are documented and in the required form, including numbering	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	a) It is evaluated, whether all relevant mandatory annexes have been delivered, which were specified in the call. b) It is evaluated, whether all annexes (mandatory and optional) are documented in the form specified by the call. It is also evaluated, whether the document is not empty and that the content of the document corresponds to its name. c) It is evaluated, whether all annexes are numbered according to the specifications of the call/IS KP14+.	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) Evaluator - evaluation of the annex form, i.e. according to the call specification (format, annex template, etc.). c) MS2014+ - numbering of mandatory annexes will be set in the grant application form
F4	The grant application was submitted in the language determined in the call	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	a) It is evaluated, whether the application incl. all required and optional annexes was made in the language determined by the call, i.e. always in Czech. b) It is evaluated, whether the support application incl. relevant annexes were submitted in the English language.	a) This criterion is met if the grant application including all compulsory/optional annexes was submitted in the Czech and English language. b) This criterion is not met if the grant applications or any of the compulsory/optional annexes was not submitted in the Czech and English language.
F5	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application: Project subjects, annexes proof of legal subjectivity	internal evaluator/MS2014+	All required identification data of the applicant (name of the statutory body or representative/representatives of the statutory body and its/their functions) are in the grant application and presented in compliance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered/listed (the document is not older than 90 days from the submission of grant application). A) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the applicant is included in the grant application.	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible with MS2014+



Annex No. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	form evaluation - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F6	Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application: - Project subjects, annex: - proof of legal subjectivity	internal evaluator/MS2014+	All required identification data for each of the partners (name of the statutory body/bodies or representative/representatives of the statutory body/statutory bodies and its/their functions) are in the grant application and presented in compliance with the extract/extracts from the register in which the partner is registered/listed. a) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the partner/partners is included in the grant application. b) It is evaluated, whether the partner's/partners' identification data is in compliance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible with MS2014+
F7	The grant application is signed by the applicant's/partner's legal representative	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, appendices	internal evaluator/MS2014+	All documents containing the signature box and the name/identification characteristics of the applicant/partner subject have an electronic signature of the statutory body or representative/representatives of the statutory body. a) It is evaluated, whether the request is electronically signed by the statutory body or an authorized person delegated by the statutory body of the applicant entity, i.e. whether the signature matches the statutory body/authorized of the applicant entity. Documents can also be signed (documents must not be older than 90 calendar days from the date of grant application submission in IS KP14+): 1) By agent authorized by power of attorney to the presented specific project. The applicant shall submit a power of attorney in el. form in IS KP14+ (requires el. signature of the principal and agent) or original/notarized copy on the tab or under the Power of attorney button in the grant application form in the IS KP14+. This power of attorney contains all formalities of power of attorney. 2) By an authorized person on the basis of a mandate to be represented by the statutory body of the applicant entity acting on behalf of the applicant entity. The authorization is documented in the form of an original/certified true copy on the tab or under the Power of attorney button in the grant application form in the IS KP14+.	a) without a signature, grant application can be submitted to the steering body - Automatically checked by MS2014+ b) evaluator - signature relevancy check c) the evaluator checks the signature of the grant application annexes by the applicant/partner. Formalities of the power of attorney: • principal clearly identified - the one who grants the power of attorney, • Agent clearly identified - the one who the the power of attorney is granted, • putting a legal act or acts for which the principal authorizes the agent, • the period for which the authorization is valid, • date and place of signing the power of attorney, • signatures of principal and agent.
F8	Estimated time of project implementation in accordance with the call terms	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, appendices	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the length of the project implementation (e.g. number of months) and the period of project implementation (from-to) correspond to the call terms.	a) This criterion is met if the duration of the project is in compliance with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call, while the project implementation period is in compliance with the call. b) This criterion is not met if the duration of the project is not in compliance with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call or the project implementation period is not in compliance with the call.



Annex No. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/ uncorrectable	formatting - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F9	The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of total eligible expenditures determined in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application (budget)	internal evaluator/M S2014+	It is evaluated, whether the amount of the total eligible expenditures correspond to the conditions of the call.	<p>a) This criterion is met if the required grant amount is in the stated range of the minimum and maximum grant amount for the particular call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met in the case that the required grant amount is not within the specified range of the minimum and maximum grant amount in the context of the call, i.e. requested funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.</p>
F10	a) The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	b) grant application (budget)	internal evaluator/M S2014+	It is evaluated, whether the grant application respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries.	<p>a) This criterion is met if the budget is set in compliance with all fin. limits under the terms of the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met if the budget setting does not match some of the fin. limits in the call.</p>
F11	The amount of the applicant's own resources in the financing summary is being provided in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, appendices - Affidavit of ensuring own funds	internal evaluator/M S2014+	It is evaluated, whether in the grant application the applicant's own resources (if relevant within the call) are included, in compliance with the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries and the wording of the call.	<p>a) This criterion is met if the amount of own resources corresponds to the conditions of the call.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the amount of own resources does not correspond to the conditions of the call.</p>
F12	Financial health/Annual turnover of the organization/company of the applicant is in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, appendices - proof of annual turnover and fin. health or affidavit of the turnover	internal evaluator	<p>Organization/applicant company annual turnover reaches at least one-half of the amount of eligible expenditures specified in the support application.</p> <p>For other obligations and conditions for the the method of documenting annual turnover, see Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part, chap. 5.2.1.</p>	<p>a) This criterion is met if the applicant documents the financial health/turnover in compliance with the call terms, i.e. annual turnover of the applicant entity achieves min. one half of the eligible project expenditures.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the applicant does not document the financial health/turnover in compliance with the call terms, i.e. annual turnover of the applicant entity does not achieve min. one half of the eligible project expenditures.</p>
F13	The uniqueness of the research infrastructure	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application	internal evaluator	Only one project at a research infrastructure is submitted.	<p>a) The criterion is met if only one project for research infrastructure is presented within the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met if a request for support for the same research infrastructure was previously applied under the same call, which is subject to evaluation of the grant application.</p>



Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Eligibility check

sequence	quality aspect of the project	criteria name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
P1	expediency	The grant application is in its focus in compliance with the objectives and activities of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Key activities - Specific objectives - Project description of the grant application annex	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the project objectives and activities correspond to the given call requirements. It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted all the required activities according to the text of the call. It is evaluated, whether a grant application does not contain any of the excluded activities according to the text and related documentation of the call. It is evaluated, whether the applicant documents a CBA in compliance with the rules specified in the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part.	a) This criterion is met if the project (activities/phases) is not in conflict with the call objectives or activities. The method of implementation of activities is not inconsistent with the conditions for implementation of the project mentioned in the call. The criterion is met if the the applicant documents a CBA in compliance with the rules specified in the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part. b) The criterion is not met if it is inconsistent with the objectives and/or activities of the call or the way of implementation of activities is contrary to the conditions for the implementation of the project mentioned in the call and/or the applicant has not submitted the CBA in compliance with the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part.
P2	expediency	Target groups are in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the target groups are in compliance with the legitimate target groups in the call.	a) This criterion is met if the target groups correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call. b) This criterion is not met if the target groups do not correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call.
P3	feasibility	The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	a) grant application: b) - Project annex subjects	internal evaluator/MS2014+	Within this criteria it is evaluated, whether the applicant entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call and related documentation.	a) This criterion is met if the applicant can be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) and also meets the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE applicants and recipients, unless the call determines otherwise. b) This criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) or does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE, , unless the call determines otherwise. IS KP14+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the applicant. The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries are met as defined in the call.
P4	feasibility	The project partner meets the conditions of eligibility of a partner	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Project subjects, annex;	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set out in the call and related documentation to the call.	a) This criterion is met if the partner can be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) and also meets the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise. b) This criterion is not met if the partner cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) or does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise. MS2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the partner. The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries are met as defined in the call.
P5	feasibility	Place of implementation and place of impact of the project in compliance with the terms of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Location - Activities - Key activities - Project description annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the place of implementation and place of impact of the project is in compliance with the conditions set in the call, i.e. specific project activities have an impact only on the relevant territory defined in the call.	The applicant selects the place of impact/place of implementation from a preset dial in relation to specific activities. The evaluator checks the entire application in relation to specific activities: a) This criterion is met if the project has an impact only on the territory according to the call and place of implementation corresponds to the conditions of the call. b) This criterion is not met if the project has not an impact only on the territory according to the call or the place of implementation does not correspond to the conditions of the call.

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure – Eligibility check

sequence	quality aspect of the project	criteria name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
P6	feasibility/effectiveness	Project activities outcomes are unique for applicants/partners	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Project description - Activities - Key activities Annexes (MS2014+ database outputs OP EC)	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another OP RDE project. There must be always substantively different or follow-up outcomes. Evaluation takes place via the IS KP14+ or OP RDE outputs database. It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another OP EC / OP RDI. There must be always substantively different or follow-up activities/outcomes. Verification will take place via control of outcomes in subjects as recipients in the OP EC / OP RDI database outputs.	a) This criterion is met if the project activities are unique for the applicant/partners, i.e. endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, which were already supported for the applicant/partner by another OP RDE project or another OP EC / OP RDI project. b) This criterion is not met if the project activities are not unique for the applicant/partner, i.e. endorsing the project will finance identical outputs, which were already supported for the applicant/partner by another OP RDE and/or other OP EC / OP RDI project.
P7	feasibility	Documented involvement of the partner in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: annexes: - Principles of partnership/Partnership Contract	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the conditions for the involvement of the partner is in compliance with the call.	a) This criterion is met when the involvement of the partner is in compliance with the conditions in the call. b) The criterion is not met if the partnership is not set up in compliance with the terms of the call.

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspect of the project	criterion number	criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point boundary in the case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluator for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions
Applicant /partner	feasibility	V1.1	The structure and size of the administrative team (employments including possible outsourcing)	5	20	grant application: - Implementation team - Key activities	external evaluator	evaluating		x	x	4	The structure and size of the administrative team is evaluated resp. employment including possible outsourcing, with respect to the character and scope of activities and size of the project. The administrative team consists of job positions project manager, financial manager and other positions to ensure the implementation of the project. The applicant describes within obligatory activities the Project management and connecting mandatory grant application annexes on the support of the Implementation team or can demonstrate the workers' CV in the annex.	5 points - the applicant has sufficient administrative staff for the project. 4 - 2 points - The administrative team corresponds with its focus and size to the planned project, the evaluator has partial objections. 1 - 0 points - the applicant does not have sufficient administrative staff of good quality for the project. The subject of evaluation is not the level of tariffs (criterion V4.1 is evaluated), but only the size and structure of the administrative team.
	feasibility	V1.2	The structure and size of the expert team (employments including possible outsourcing)	10		grant application: - Implementation team - Key activities Annexes: - Feasibility study			combined		5	8	The structure and size of the expert team is evaluated resp. employment including possible outsourcing, with respect to the character and scope of activities and size of the project. The expert team consists of jobs that provide substantive fulfilment of project activities. The applicant describes within obligatory activities the Project management and connecting mandatory grant application annexes on the support of the Implementation team. Documents the CV of expert team members in the annex. Documented are at least 50% of the FTE members of the expert team. The applicant defines the key and/or excellent staff in the grant application. Share of the key and/or excellence workers in the professional team can be a max. 20 %.	10 - 8 points - The expert team corresponds with its focus and size to the planned project, the evaluator has no objections. 7 - 5 points - The expert team corresponds with its focus and size to the planned project, the evaluator has partial objections. 4 - 0 points - The applicant does not ensure a sufficient expert team for the project, the expert team setting threatens the feasibility of the project. The subject of evaluation is not the level of tariffs (criterion V4.1 is evaluated), but only the size and structure of the expert team.
	efficiency	V1.3	The structure, size, manner and extent of involvement of the opponent group	5		grant application: - Implementation team - Key activities Annexes: - Feasibility study			evaluating		x	4	It is evaluated, whether the applicant has or will have at latest on the 31. 12. 2017 an established opposition group (e.g. Scientific Board), which task will be to submit feedback to the professional activities realized for the theme of the project. Evaluated are the structure, size and the manner and extent of involvement of the opponent group with respect to the nature and scope of activities and size of the project. The applicant describes obligatory activities within the Project management. Detailed specifications of the opponents groups see Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part.	5 points - The opponent team group corresponds to the structure and size of the planned project, the manner and extent of involvement complies with international practice. The evaluator has no objections. 4 - 3 points - The opponent team group altogether corresponds to the structure and size of the planned project, the manner and extent of involvement altogether complies with international practice. The evaluator has partial objections. 2 - 0 points - The opponent team group does not correspond to the structure and size of the planned project, the manner and extent of involvement does not comply with international practice. The setting of the opponent group threatens its task.
Project implementation description	usefulness	V2.1	Quality and potential of the project's research programme/programmes	10	50	grant application: - Project description Annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating	combined	x	5	8	If the project's intentions contribute to increasing the quality of current research intentions or to the quality of new research intentions, what will the project's intentions contribute in the given area of R&D.	10 - 8 points - The quality and potential of the research/research programme(s) contribute to enhancing the quality of existing research projects or the quality of new research projects. The evaluator has no objections. 7 - 5 points - The quality and potential of the research/research programme(s) contribute to enhancing the quality of existing research projects or the quality of new research projects. The evaluator has partial objections. 4 - 0 points - It is not clear, how the research/research programme(s) will contribute to enhancing the quality of existing research projects or the quality of new research projects. The research/Research programme(s) will not contribute to improve the quality of existing research projects or the quality of new research projects.
	usefulness / effectiveness	V2.2	Quality and potential research project's activities	10		grant application: - Project description Annexes: - Feasibility study			combined		5	8	Whether such research activities are high-quality and relevant to research programme(s) and whether they contribute to the development and quality of research programmes	10 - 8 points - The research activities of the project are of high quality, relevant and contribute to the development and quality of research/research programme(s) of the project. The evaluator has no objections. 7 - 5 points - The research activities of the project are relevant and contribute to the development and quality of research/research programme(s) of the project. The quality of the research activities is unclear. The evaluator has partial objections, mainly to the quality of research activities. 4 - 0 points - The research activities of the project are not of high quality, relevant and do not contribute to the development and quality of research/research programme(s) of the project.
	usefulness / effectiveness	V2.3	Logical sequence and thematic compliance of research objectives of the project with respect to the existing research activities of the research infrastructure	10		grant application: - Target groups Annexes: - Feasibility study			combined		5	8	To what extent are the research objectives and research activities of the project complementary to existing research activities in the research infrastructure? Consider whether the proposed research activities are an appropriate and necessary complementing of existing research activities, and whether any of them overlap. What is the thematic compliance of research objectives and research activities of the project with the existing research activities of the research infrastructure?	10 - 8 points - Research objectives and research activities of the project are complementary to existing research activities in the research infrastructure. The evaluator has no objections. 7 - 5 points - Research objectives and research activities of the project are complementary to existing research activities in the research infrastructure. The evaluator has partial objections. 4 - 0 points - Research objectives and research activities of the project are not complementary to existing research activities in the research infrastructure.

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspect of the project	criterion number	criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point boundary in the case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions		
	expediency	V2.4	Factual content and relevance of activities	10		grant application: - Target groups - Key activities Annexes: - Feasibility study			combined		5	8	The proposed method of specific project implementation, material quality and content of the project is evaluated . Activities must be planned in compliance with the objectives and conditions of the call. The planned project activities must be specifically described and linked to the project budget (incl. all required activities according to the text of the call). The setting a description of the activities of the project is a key indicator of future project implementation, indicator performances and project objectives, including its benefits and overall meaningfulness.	10 points - The activities are designed quite adequately to the project goals and are fully described, their relation to budget items and the related outputs can be well identified 9 - 5 points - the activities are adequately designed for the project objectives, but their description leaves a doubts about certain aspects of their implementation 4 - 0 points - The activities are completely inadequately designed for the project objectives, they are vague and inadequate, coherence of activities and the budget cannot be identified		
	feasibility	V2.5	Time schedule and logical consistency of project activities	5		grant application: - Key activities - Time schedule for key activities			combined		1	4	It is evaluated, whether the proposed time schedule of activities, including any procurement procedure, is logically and feasibly set. Activities must follow each other smoothly. It is evaluated, whether the continuity of the activities implemented is appropriately divided, given the applicant's potential (implementation team).	5 points - Project activities are logically linked, and the time allocated to each key activity is appropriate. 4 - 1 points - Project activities are logically linked, time allocation is not adequate or not feasibly set. 0 points - Project activities are not logically linked, the time schedule is not feasibly set, the time schedule threatens the implementation of the project.		
	feasibility	V2.6	Risk management - preparedness for possible risks and their solutions	5		grant application: - Project description - Public procurement Annexes: - Feasibility study			combined		2	4	It is evaluated, whether the project reflects the existence of risks in the implementation of activities and in financial and operational management of the project. It is also necessary that the project includes ways to prevent risks and proposed measures to eliminate these risks. The purpose of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the applicant is aware of the risks and which mechanisms are used to eliminate them, resp. which actions will be taken in the event that problems arise. The evaluation must also include planned procurement procedures, i.e. Whether, in compliance with the project budget, corresponding procurement procedures are planned (or whether it is justified, why tenders are not planned, e.g. because of a already concluded framework agreement).	5 - 2 points - Definition of risks and actions are clear. 1 - 0 points - The planned procurement procedures are not described, the definition of risk is quite general and insufficient.		
Results and outputs	expediency	V3.1	Appropriateness of selected indicators of outputs and results	5	25	grant application: - Indicators	evaluating	combined	x		1	4	It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.	5 points – It is evident from the description of the project that activities correspond to chosen indicators and lead to achieving results / outcome. 4 - 1 point - Activities corresponding to the selected indicators, but for accurate description of achievements / outputs the evaluator suggests additions. 0 points - Selected activities do not correspond to the indicators, are set ambiguously and/or from the description of the project can not even be evaluated which indicators should be monitored.		
	efficiency / effectiveness	V3.2	Appropriateness and feasibility of results and outputs of the project	10	grant application: - annex indicators: Summary of the key outputs of the ERDF fulfillment of indicators	combined							5	8	The appropriateness of setting quantified indicators for the planned project activities is evaluated. Specifically, the feasibility and appropriateness of setting given indicator values in relation to the objectives, time schedule (milestones) and the project budget is evaluated . The method of determining initial and target values is evaluated .	10 points - The proposed indicator values are reasonable to the activities and their achievement is very realistic. 9 - 5 points - The proposed indicator values are reasonable to the activities and their achievement is realistic. The evaluator found little shortcomings in their calculation. Adjustment is needed in terms of monitored indicators. 4 - 0 points - The proposed indicators are not appropriate and/or the feasibility of achieving the planned values is not very high. A fundamental adjustment in terms of monitored indicators is needed. The adjusted values are ambiguous, inappropriate, improper or completely unreal or their value cannot be determined from the project description.
	expediency	V3.3	Project output specifications	10	annex: Summary of the key outputs of the ERDF project fulfillment of indicators	combined							5	8	It is evaluated, whether the the key outcomes for the fulfillment of indicators are clearly specified and described, the applicant must specify the key outcomes in the annex of the grant application.	10 - 8 points - The applicant clearly describes the outcomes of systemic products in the annex to the grant application, the evaluator has no objections. 7 - 5 points - The applicant clearly describes the outcomes of systemic products in the annex to the grant application, the evaluator has partial objections. 4 - 0 points - The annex summary of the key outputs for the fulfillment of ERDF project indicators does not contain specifications of all system products outputs, the applicant describes outputs inadequately, it is not clear which project outputs will be achieved.

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspect of the project	criterion number	criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point boundary in the case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluator's for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions	
Project financing	efficiency/effectiveness/economy	V4.1	The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project	15	45	grant application: - Budget		evaluating	combined	x	7	11	a) The merits of the budget amount and individual budget items are evaluated, relative to the duration of the project, activities content, planned results/outcomes in connection with the research part of the project. (In relevant cases, it is necessary to take into account the duration and intensity of work with the target group.) Whether the costs are necessary for the implementation of the project or vice versa, whether the budget is not undervalued in connection with the research part of the project. b) The adequacy of the project budget means respecting the 3E rules - economy, efficiency and effectiveness in terms of financial costs in relation to the implementation of planned activities, planned outputs and outcomes. Especially it is necessary to consider: - Adequacy of wage costs/implementation team time jobs with respect to the quality (professionalism) of its activities and also the length of its activities related to the work with the target group (e.g. work of the lecturer with the target group, preparation of materials to work with the target group) If the applicant intends to implement the project also with external supplies, it is necessary to assess whether the procured goods or services or construction work will be used in the project, whether that are unnecessary for the project implementation and whether the parameters for the goods and services are not disproportionate. - The adequacy of the leased premises with respect to the needs of the project. - The adequacy of the quantity and characteristics of the acquired IT equipment . - Proportionality of individual budgetary chapters within the budget (e.g. the proportionality of the purchase of equipment for the production team and employments of team members). - Whether individual entries correspond to those in the usual place and time. - Whether individual entries correspond to the prices set in the procedure recommended by the steering body in the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries or in the call. The adequacy and accuracy has to be evaluated both for the individual budget items of the project, or the groups of items and the budget as a whole to avoid the evaluation of only certain parts of the budget, while others will not be taken into account. c) The clarity of the summary of budget is evaluated - the evident breakdown of costs to items and groups and their level of concretization. The merits and adequacy of the budget with respect to the objectives and content of the project must be always evaluated in the commentary to the sub-criterion. If it is found that the validity of some items in the budget is not clear or these amounts are inadequate, the evaluator is required to propose their cuts.	15 points - the budget is entirely appropriate, the parameters of procured supplies are adequate, prices can be considered as normal, budget items are linked to individual activities, enabling reliable assessment of costs and efficiency and no adjustment of the budget is proposed. 14 - 12 points - The budget is, except for minor observations, reasonable, limited are items that are not justified in the description of the project implementation and/or their procurement volume/quantity does not match the description (the needs of the project), only a minor change of roughly up to 5% of the total budget is proposed. 11 - 9 points - the budget is slightly overvalued or undervalued, there are items that are not clear and well-reasoned and/or the purchased volume/quantity does not match the description (needs) of the project. A reduction (indicatively 5-20% of the total budget) is proposed. 8 - 7 points - The budget is overvalued or undervalued, increasingly there are items that are not justified, a significant reduction (indicatively 20-40% of the total budget) is proposed. 6 - 1 point - The budget is fundamentally overvalued or undervalued and coherence of the budget with the activities is not convincing /cannot be unambiguously identified. 0 points - The budget is totally inadequate, poorly designed and unintelligible, lacking coherence, it is confusing.	
	economy	V4.2	The adequacy and efficiency of the cost of investment equipment.	15		grant application: - Budget - CBA (FA) - Indicators annexes: - Feasibility study - Summary of the key outputs of the project fulfilment of indicators			combined		7	11	To what extent do the expenses on completion, finishing, modernizing and upgrading research infrastructure and facilities correspond to the research aims, agenda, and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the expenses on constructing, completion, modernizing and upgrading infrastructure and facilities correspond to usual prices of infrastructure and facilities of this sort. In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.	15 points - Cost of capital for equipment is adequate and economical. 14 - 12 points - Costs are despite minor observations adequate and efficient, to a limited extent there are costs that are overvalued, the proposed change is only small-scale (roughly up to 10% of the total budget). 11 - 8 points - The budget is overvalued or undervalued, there are items that are not justified, a significant reduction (indicatively 10-40% of the total budget) is proposed. 7 - 1 point - Costs are fundamentally overvalued and are not economical. 0 points - Costs are totally inadequate and inefficient.	
	expediency	V4.3	General conditions for eligibility of expenditures.	5		annex: Summary of the key outputs of the ERDF project fulfilment of indicators			evaluating			x	4	The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of expenditure eligibility, i.e. the material, local and temporal expenditure eligibility in the budget. In the event that the grant application contains an ineligible expenditure, the evaluator proposes its elimination from the budget.	5 points - The budget is completely in compliance with the eligibility rules. 4 - 2 points - The budget includes ineligible expenditures, which can be eliminated from the budget on the basis of evaluator objections. 1 - 0 points - The project budget includes ineligible expenditures, which cannot be eliminated from the budget while keeping the project's feasibility.
	economy	V4.4	Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.	10		grant application: Financial resources summary CBA (FA)				combined		5	8	It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.	10 - 8 points - the applicant is able to demonstrate how it will provide co-financing of the project. The method of securing is clear and realistic. 7 - 5 points - the applicant is able to demonstrate how it will provide co-financing of the project. The method of securing is clear, but shows underestimation/overestimation. Minor changes are recommended. 4 - 0 points - the applicant is not able to demonstrate how it will provide co-financing of the project. The way of securing co-financing is unclear/vague/unrealistic. In the event that the applicant has a 0% co-financing, the project is evaluated with full points.
Construction and technical parameters	effectiveness/efficiency	V5.1	Use of existing applicant's research centre infrastructure for needs of the project.	5	30	grant application: - Project description annexes: - Feasibility study		combined	evaluating	12	x	23	To what extent will the existing infrastructure and research infrastructure equipment be used for the implementation of research programmes and activities of the project? Consider the effectiveness and efficiency of existing infrastructure and equipment to implement the research agenda.	5 points - the project fully leverages existing infrastructure. 4 - 2 points - the project uses existing infrastructure in part, there is completion/construction/modernization/infrastructure upgrades. 1 - 0 points - the project does not leverage existing infrastructure.	

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspect of the project	criterion number	criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point score of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point boundary in the case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluator s for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions
	feasibility	V5.2	Investments parameters for implementation of the project research agenda		10	grant application: - Project description annexes: - Feasibility study			evaluating		x		Are the parameters of investment in infrastructure and equipment clear and realistic? Do the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment correspond to research programmes and activities of the project? Are the mentioned investment parameters in infrastructure and equipment adequate for the needs of the development of research infrastructure? Projects that do not contain activity a), receive full points in this criterion.	10 - 8 points - The investment parameters are clear, realistic and match the needs of the development of research infrastructure. 7 - 6 points - The investment parameters are clear and altogether match the needs of the development of research infrastructure. Those parameters of individual investments exhibit undervaluation/overvaluation in their adequacy. Minor changes are recommended. 5 - 3 points - The investment parameters are not clear and match the needs of the development of research infrastructure to a limited extent. Those parameters of individual investments exhibit undervaluation/overvaluation in their adequacy. Substantial changes are recommended. 2 - 0 points - The investment parameters are not clear and do not match the needs of the development of research infrastructure. Those parameters of individual investments exhibit major undervaluation/overvaluation in their adequacy. Major changes are recommended.
	feasibility	V5.3	Feasibility of the plan and time schedule for procurement procedure for the completion/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure		10	grant application: - Project description annex: - Feasibility study - summary of the key outputs of the ERDF project fulfilment of indicators			evaluating		x		Is the plan and time schedule feasible for procurement procedure for the completion/construction/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure? Do the mentioned plan and time schedule correspond to research programmes and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and procurement procedure correspond to the plan and time schedule for the implementation of research programmes and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and procurement procedure time schedule correspond to the plan and time schedule for the recruitment of workers for the project? Do the plan and time schedule of procurement procedure take into account the statutory period with a reasonable time to spare? Projects that do not contain activity a), receive full points in this criterion.	10 - 8 points - Plan and time schedule for procurement procedure are clear and feasible. 7 - 5 points - Plan and time schedule for procurement procedure are clear, but show underestimation/overestimation in their feasibility. Minor changes are recommended. 4 - 0 points - Plan and the schedule for procurement procedure are unclear/vague/not feasible.
	efficiency	V5.4	Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact on the ability to achieve aims of the project.		5	grant application: - Project description annexes: - Feasibility study			evaluating		x		To what extent are risks of investment readiness/investments identified in the project proposal? Take into consideration how adequate the evaluation of risks is. Take into consideration efficiency of the measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact on the ability to achieve aims of the project. Take into consideration if a contingency plan for dealing with incidence of several serious risks at time is part of the project proposal?	5 points - Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact is clear and real for the ability to achieve the project aims. 4 - 2 points - Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact is clear for the ability to achieve the project aims, their realism is overvaluated. Modifications are recommended. 1 - 0 points - Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact is unclear/unreal for the ability to achieve the project aims.
Horizontal topics	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V6.1	Activities promoting equal opportunities	yes/no		x grant application: - Horizontal principles		exclusion	exclusion	x	x	yes/no	Equal opportunities are evaluated regardless of the type of disability or social disadvantage, e.g. health, economic, social, ethnic, gender or nationality etc. Specifically, it is evaluated how the equal opportunities are fulfilled through proposed activities. A possible example of taking account of equal opportunities within the project is to provide an accessible space for the project implementation.	Yes - The project is in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic. No - The project is not in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.
	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V6.2	Activities supporting a sustainable development	yes/no		grant application: - Horizontal principles			exclusion			yes/no	The relationship of the project to sustainable development is evaluated, especially its environmental pillars. Specifically, the proposals leading to reduce negative environmental impacts should be evaluated (minimizing noise emissions, air emissions, environmental contamination, etc.) or conversely the effects of the project on environmental improvements. It is also necessary to take into account and assess the project's contribution to raise awareness about sustainable development (especially on environmental issues), the judicious use of natural resources (where appropriate) and the project's contribution to strengthen the social and economic pillars of sustainability. <i>If applicable:</i> The grant application shall include an environmental indicator output ("Extended, renovated or newly built capacities without the annexation of agricultural land."). <i>If applicable:</i> It will be checked whether or not the project is implemented on parcels that extend into the territory of specially protected areas or NATURA 2000 areas. (http://mapy.nature.cz/ , http://mapy.nature.cz/ , application mapomat, tab protection of the nature. It is necessary to cross the layers of the given nature protection and landscapes and layers of cadastral maps).	Yes - The project is in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic. No - The project is not in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.
	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V6.3	Activities supporting non-discrimination	yes/no		grant application: - Horizontal principles			exclusion			yes/no	It is evaluated, whether there is no project to discriminate certain groups.	Yes - The project is in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic. No - The project is not in compliance with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.
Compliance with the strategy	expediency	V7.1	Compliance with RIS3	yes/no		x annex: The confirmation of activities following the strategic objectives of the National Strategy RIS3		exclusion	exclusion	x	x	yes/no	It is evaluated, whether the project is with its activities/content in compliance with RIS3 according to the text of the call and contributes to their achievement.	It is evaluated, whether the focus of research programmes and activities is in compliance with at least one generic knowledge domain or with at least one key sector application and application topic listed in the National RIS3 strategy or regional annex.

Annex no. 2 Call Research Infrastructure - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspect of the project	criterion number	criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point boundary in the case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions
CBA	economy	V8.1	CBA	yes/no	x	CBA (EA)		exclusion	exclusion	x	x	yes/no	The grant application is evaluated by CBA (socio-economic analysis) provided by the applicant in the CBA module in IS KP14+.	<p>YES - positive result of socio-economic analysis of the project (positive economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return equal to or greater than the discount rate), used inputs are adequately justified and appear as real</p> <p>YES - positive result of socio-economic analysis of the project (positive economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return equal to or greater than the discount rate), though used inputs are partially overstated or understated, the justification is not complete.</p> <p>YES - the applicant is not obliged to process the CBA, if in the budget it is true that investments \leq 50% of the total eligible budget expenditure or total eligible expenditures are less than 5 mil. CZK.</p> <p>NO - negative result of socio-economic analysis of the project (negative economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return less than the discount rate) or used inputs into the economic evaluation of the application were not adequately justified and appear as unreal</p>
Max. number of points				170										
Min. number of points to advance to the next stage of the approval process				110										
Min. point spread of the overall eval. of 2 evaluators to use an arbitrator				34 or more										