



Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Long-term Intersectoral Cooperation" – formal check										
criticon code	Project quality aspect	criticon name	position	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method(yes/no, irrelevant)	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criticon description	main source of information	criticon description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
F1	x	The application for support has been submitted in the required form.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	MS2014+	x	application for support	A check is made whether the application was finalized in electronic form in IS KP14+.	MS2014+ - automatic check when submitting the application; the application for support may only be submitted electronically.
F2	x	All the required fields in the aid application are filled.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	MS2014+	x	application for support	Checked automatically, particularly at the phase of finalisation of application for support.	(a) MS2014+ – automatic check of fields set as required (b) Evaluator – check of fields that are marked as required in the call / follow-up documentation, including a check of demonstration of ownership structure
F3	x	All annexes have been submitted in the required form	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	annexes to application for support	(a) a check is made whether all relevant mandatory/elective annexes specified in the Call have been submitted.  (b) a check is made whether all annexes (mandatory/elective/optional) have been submitted in the form specified by the call. An assessment is made whether or not the document is empty and whether the document content corresponds to its name.  (c) A check is made whether all the attachments are numbered according to IS KP14+.	(a) MS2014+ – check whether the mandatory annexes have been filled, annex numbering present in IS KP14+  (b) evaluator – check whether elective annexes have been submitted, check of their form, i.e. according to the call specification (annex format, model, basic structure / outline, etc.).
F4	x	The application for support was submitted in the language determined by the call	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support  annexes to the application for support	(a) a check is made whether the application incl. all annexes has been submitted in the language determined by the call, i.e. always in Czech.  (b) a check is made whether the application for support has also been submitted in English. The duty to submit EN version will be stated in the text of the call / follow-up documentation, incl. specification of the parts of / annexes to the application for support which must be submitted in English.	(a) The criterion is met if the application for support including all annexes has been submitted in Czech. The criterion is met if the application for support including all relevant annexes has also been submitted in English.  (b) The criterion is not met if the application for support or some of its annexes have not been submitted in Czech and English.
F5	x	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: – project entities  annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the required identification data of the applicant (name of the governing body or representative(s) of the governing body and their positions) are specified in the application for support and are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered.  (a) A check is made whether the application for support includes the identification data of the applicant.  (b) A check is made whether the applicant's identification data are in line with the extract from the register (e.g. a register of schools and school facilities, commercial register, trade register, company register, etc.).	(a) MS2014+ – a check whether the required fields are filled out (b) MS2014+ – a check for compliance with extracts from registers  (c) evaluator – check for compliance with extracts from registers if this is impossible through MS2014+

F6	x	Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the partner is registered.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: – project entities  annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the required identification data of each of the partners (name of the governing body (bodies) or representative(s) of the governing body (bodies) and their positions) are specified in the application for support and are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the partner is registered.  (a) A check is made whether the application for support includes the identification data of the partner(s).  (b) A check is made whether the partners' identification data are in line with the extract from the register (e.g. a register of schools and school facilities, commercial register, trade register, company register, etc.).	(a) MS2014+ – a check whether the required fields are filled out  (b) MS2014+ – a check for compliance with extracts from registers(c) evaluator – check for compliance with extracts from registers if this is impossible through MS2014+
F7	x	The application for support has been signed by the governing body of the applicant/partner.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support  annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the documents containing the box for signature and name/identification of the applicant/partner have been electronically signed by the governing body or representative(s) of the governing body.  A check is made whether the application has been electronically signed by the governing body or an authorized person authorised by the governing body of the applicant/partner's entity, i.e. whether the signature matches the governing body / authorized person of the applicant/partner's entity.  The documents can also be signed by:  (1) another person authorized by a power of attorney in relation a specific project. The applicant submits the power of attorney in electronic form in IS KP14+ (requires el. signature of the principal and agent) or original/notarized copy in electronic/scanned form under the "Power of attorney" tab or key in the aid application form in IS KP14+. This power of attorney contains all the elements of a power of attorney.  (2) a person authorized based on a mandate to be represented by the governing body of applicant/partner's entity to make juridical acts on behalf of the applicant's entity. The mandate is submitted in a scanned form as an original/notarised copy on the "Power of attorney" tab or button in the aid application form in IS KP14+.	(a) MS2014+ – checked automatically, application for support cannot be submitted to the MA without a signature.  (b) evaluator – check of signature relevance, Elements of the power of attorney: • uniquely identifies the principal – the person who grants the power of attorney • uniquely identifies the agent – the person who receives the power of attorney • specification of a juridical 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 the principal and agent
F8	x	Estimated time of project implementation is in accordance with the terms of the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support  annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether the project duration (e.g. number of months) and the project period (from-to) correspond to the conditions of the call.	(a) The criterion is met if the project duration is in line with the project duration specified in the call, and simultaneously the project period is in line with the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the project duration is not in line with the project duration specified in the call, or the project period is not in line with the call.

<b>F9</b>	x	The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of the total eligible expenditure specified by the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support:  - budget  annexes to application for support:	A check is made whether the amount of total eligible expenditure correspond to the conditions of the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the required amount of financial support is within the minimum and maximum amount of financial support for the particular call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the required amount of financial assistance is not within the minimum and maximum amount of financial support for the particular call, i.e. the claimed funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.
<b>F10</b>	x	The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support:  - budget	A check is made whether the application respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the budget is set in accordance with all fin. limits according to the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the setting of the budget is not in accordance with any of the fin. limits in the call.
<b>F11</b>	x	The amount of the applicant's own funds in the funding overview is stated in accordance with the call	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	annexes to application for support:  – a statutory declaration on the applicant's own funds	A check is made whether the application for support includes the applicant's own funds (if relevant for the particular type of applicant/call in accordance with the call / follow-up call documentation).	(a) The criterion is met if the amount of own funds meets the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the amount of own funds fails to meet the conditions of the call.
<b>F12</b>	x	Financial stability / turnover of the applicant for two consecutive (closed) accounting periods	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support  annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether the annual turnover if the applicant's entity meets the conditions of the call / follow-up call documentation. For additional duties and conditions concerning the demonstration of annual turnover, see Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries – Specific Part, Chapter 5.2.1.	(a) The criterion is met if the applicant has demonstrated turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the applicant has failed to demonstrate turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call.

Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Long-term Intersectoral Cooperation" – eligibility check

critereon code	Project quality aspect	critereon name	position	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method(yes/no, irrelevant)	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief critereon description	main source of information	critereon description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
P1	efficiency	The focus of the application for support is in accordance with the activities of the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: – key activities – specific objectives – project description  annexes to application fro support	An assessment is made whether the project activities are consistent with the conditions of the call. An assessment is made whether the applicant has specified all the required activities according to the text of the call. An assessment is made whether or not the application for support contains any of the excluded activities according to the text of the call and the follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the project (activities/stages) is not in conflict with the activities of the call. The method to carry out the activities is not in conflict with the conditions for the implementation of the project set in the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if it is in conflict with the activities of the call, or the manner to implement the activities is in conflict with the conditions for the implementation of the project set in the call and in accordance with the conditions in the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries – Specific Part.
P2	efficiency	Target groups are in accordance with the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: – target groups  annexes to the application for support:	A check is made whether the target groups in the application for support are in accordance with the eligible target groups in the call / follow-up documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the target groups are in accordance with the eligible target groups defined in the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the target groups are in conflict with the eligible target groups defined in the call.
P3	feasibility	The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: – Project entities  annexes to the application for support:	An assessment is made whether the applicant's entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call / follow-up documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the applicant can be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) and also meets the conditions set by the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) or fails to meet the conditions set by the call. ISKP14+ is connected with the insolvency register to check insolvency of applicants.
P4	feasibility	Project partner meets the conditions for the eligibility of the partner	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: – Project entities  annexes to the application for support: – Principles of partnership – Partnership agreement	An assessment is made whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set in the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the partner can be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) and also meets the conditions set by the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the partner cannot be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) or fails to meet the conditions set by the call.
P5	feasibility	The place of project implementation and impact is in compliance with the conditions of the call.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: – Location – Key activities – Project description  annexes to application for support:	An assessment is made whether the place of project implementation and impact are in accordance with the conditions set in the call (follow-up conditions of the call). The applicant selects the place of impact/implementation from the code list in relation to specific activities.	(a) The criterion is met if the project has an impact on the territory under the call and the place of implementation corresponds to the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the project does not have an impact on the territory under the call or the place of implementation does not correspond to the conditions of the call.

P6	feasibility/effectiveness	Project activities are unique for applicants/partners	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	<p>application for support: – Project description – Key activities</p> <p>annexes to the application for support: (MS2014+, database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI)</p>	<p>An assessment is made whether supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from another OP RDE project. The content of these outcomes must always be different or related.</p> <p>A check is made via the IS KP14+ or the database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI. A check is made whether supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from another OP EC / OP RDI project. The content of these activities/outcomes must always be different or related. Verification will take place via checking outcomes in entities in the capacity of beneficiaries in the database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI.</p>	<p>(a) The criterion is met if the project activities are unique for applicant/partners, i.e. supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from an OP RDE or another OP EC / OP RDI project.</p> <p>(b) The criterion is not met if the project activities are not unique for applicant/partners, i.e. supporting the project results in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from an OP RDE or another OP EC / OP RDI project.</p>
P7	feasibility	Involvement of a partner has been demonstrated in accordance with the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator	x	<p>application for support: annexes to application for support: Principles of partnership / Partnership agreement</p>	<p>An assessment is made whether the conditions for the involvement of a partners are in accordance with the call / follow-up call documentation.</p>	<p>(a) The criterion is met if the involvement of the partner meets the conditions of the call.</p> <p>(b) The criterion is not met if the partnership is not set in accordance with the conditions of the call.</p>
P8	efficiency	The project is in line with State aid rules.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	<p>application for support annexes to the application for support</p>	<p>An assessment is made: (a) whether the call allows aid not constituting State aid, whether the project does not cumulatively constitute elements of State aid. If the project cumulatively constitutes elements of State aid, a check is made whether any of the exemptions allowed by the call has been applied to the project (e.g. de minimis) and whether the project respects the limits of the exemption set by the call / Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries;  (b) where the call sets/allows the application of an exemption (de minimis, SGEI, GBER), whether the project respects the limits of the exemption set by the call / Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries.</p> <p>The check is based on the applicant's declaration (annex to aid application), which is used to evaluate whether or not the project cumulatively constitutes State aid and whether or not any of the exemptions concerning compatible State aid will be applied to the project.</p> <p>The verification is recorded in a checklist.</p> <p>Different options depending on the scheme: - aid not constituting State aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). Check according to the checklist – to verify (based on the applicant's declaration) whether or not the project cumulatively constitutes State aid - de minimis aid in accordance with Regulation No 1407/2013- services of general economic interest pursuant to Decision 2012/21/EU - aid in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014</p>	<p>(a) the criterion is met if the project does not cumulatively constitute State aid.</p> <p>(b) the criterion is not met if the project constitutes State aid.</p>



Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Long-term Intersectoral Cooperation" – substantive evaluation – step 1

criticon code	Project quality aspect	criticon name	function – criteria	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – root criterion	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – criterion	minimum score in the case of combined criteria	minimum score range of evaluators for arbitrator involvement – root criterion	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criterion description	main source of information	criticon description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
V1.1	feasibility	Overlap of applications fro support, submitted in the calls	exclusionary	x	yes/no	x	x	internal evaluator	An assessment is made whether or not identical applications for support have been submitted in the call for ITI projects and call outside ITI projects.	application for support: – project entities – key activities – project description annexes to application for support: – feasibility study	An assessment is made whether or not identical applications for support have been submitted in the call for ITI projects and call outside ITI projects. The evaluator checks whether or not the applicant has submitted identical applications in the calls, not only in terms of the title, but also the actual content.	YES – no identical applications have been submitted in/outside an ITI call. NO – identical application have been submitted in/outside an ITI call.

Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Long-term Intersectoral Cooperation" – substantive evaluation

root criterion name	criterion code	Project quality aspect	criterion name	function – criteria	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – root criterion	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – criterion	minimum score in the case of combined criteria	minimum score range of evaluators for arbitrator involvement – root criterion	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criterion description	main source of information	criterion description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
Applicant/partner	V2.1	feasibility	The structure and size of the administrative team (FTEs, including possible outsourcing)	evaluation	25	5	x	10	external evaluator	An assessment is made of the structure and size of the administration team / FTEs, including any outsourcing, with regard to the character and scope of activities and project size.	application for support: – key activities annexes to the application for support: - feasibility study	An assessment is made of the structure and size of the administration team, FTEs, including any outsourcing, with regard to the character and scope of activities and project size. The administrative team consists of positions such as project manager, financial manager and other positions responsible for project administration.  The evaluator states its objections and reduces the score if the structure and size of the administrative team is overvalued or undervalued.  The evaluator does not evaluate the rates (evaluated under criterion V5.1 Appropriateness and consistency of the budget in relation to the content and scope of the project), but only the size, structure and, where relevant, the composition of the project team.	The applicant describes the structure and size of the administrative team under the criterion:  5 to 4 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The applicant has sufficient administrative team for the implementation of the project.  3 to 2 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings.  1 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant does not have sufficient administrative team for the implementation of the project.
	V2.2	feasibility	The structure and size of the professional team (FTEs, including possible outsourcing)	combined		10		4		An assessment is made of the structure and size of the expert team / FTEs, including any outsourcing, with regard to the character and scope of activities and project size.	application for support: – key activities annexes to the application for support: - CV of the expert team members - feasibility study  Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of the structure and size of the expert team, also with regard to the structure of the team within the cooperation established with project partners. An assessment is made of FTEs, including any outsourcing, with regard to the character and scope of activities and project size.  The professional team consists of positions that ensure the performance of the content of the project activities.  The evaluator states its objections and reduces the score if the structure and size of the expert team is overvalued or undervalued. The evaluator does not evaluate the rates (criterion used for evaluation is V5.1 Appropriateness and consistency of the budget in relation to the content and scope of the project), but only the size, structure and, where relevant, the composition of the project team.  In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	The applicant describes the structure and size of the expert team under the criterion:  10 to 8 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The structure, focus and size of the expert team is consistent with the project.  7 to 4 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings.  3 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant does not have a sufficient team to carry out the project, the set up of the expert team threatens the feasibility of the project.  The evaluator does not evaluate the rates (criterion used for evaluation is V5.1), but only the size and structure of the expert team.
	V2.3	feasibility/efficiency	Quality of nominated members of the expert team	combined		10		4		An assessment is made of the quality of the nominated members of the expert research team and the relevance of their current research work to the research activities of the project.	application for support: annexes to application for support: - CVs of the expert team members - feasibility study  Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of the quality of the nominated members of the expert research team and the relevance of their current research work to the research activities of the project. Attached to the application for support are expert team CVs of named researchers (including a description of their experience). Results for the past five years are particularly relevant for key and excellent workers.  In the evaluation, take account of the research results relevant to the given field of research. This particularly means the H-index, number of citations for the specified publications, the IF of journals in which the researcher publishes, awards and other parameters that indicate the quality of the researcher, including his/her previous collaboration with the application sector. Assess the extent to which the current research activities of these researchers are relevant to the project's research objectives, programmes and activities, and what potential they have for the successful implementation of the project's research objectives, programmes and activities.  In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	The applicant has described the criterion in the application for support as follows:  10 to 8 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The key researchers have the required level comparable to the international level, as evidenced by their history.  7 to 4 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The key researchers will be able to carry out research activities and achieve their objectives and commitments; their quality varies and is below the expected level.  3 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. According to their history, the quality of the key researchers is not so good and there is a risk that they will not be able to implement activities as planned and meet their commitments.



Project description:	V3.1	necessity	Project necessity	combined	60	5	2	24
	V3.2	necessity/efficiency	The impact, benefits and main purpose of the project	combined		5	2	
	V3.3	efficiency	Substantive content and relevance of activities	combined		10	4	

<p>The criterion aims to justify the project objectives and show the need of their achievement given the current state of knowledge in the given area/field and the expected benefits, results and outcome of the project.</p>	<p>application for support: – Project description</p> <p>annexes to the application for support: - Feasibility study - An overview of the key outputs to achieve the ERDF indicators</p>	<p>The criterion aims to justify the project objectives and show the need of their achievement given the current state of knowledge in the given area/field and the expected benefits, results and outcome of the project.</p>	<p>The applicant has described the necessity of the project:</p> <p>5 to 4 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The applicant has described the problem well – the justification of the objective and the necessity of the project. The justification is substantiated by sufficient materials, the conclusions fully correspond with the project plans, clearly and reliably specified necessity of the project.</p> <p>3 to 2 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The applicant has described the problem – the justification of the objective and the necessity of the project. The justification is substantiated only partially and/or only partially corresponds with the project plan. The necessity for the project implementation is justified at a general level.</p> <p>1 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The application for support lacks a clearly defined problem. Justification is not substantiated or does not correspond with the project plan. The method to address the problem is not sufficiently described. Necessity is not convincingly described or only declarative phrases are specified.</p>
<p>An assessment is made of whether the method to solve the problem (defined on the basis of the project's necessity, cr. V3.1) and achieving the project objectives (defined based on necessity) will represent a noticeable contribution to the objectives defined under the call.</p>	<p>application for support: – Project description</p> <p>annexes to the application for support: - feasibility study - an overview of the key outputs to achieve the ERDF indicators</p> <p>Opinion of an external expert</p>	<p>An assessment is made of whether the method to solve the problem (defined on the basis of the project's necessity, cr. V3.1) and achieving the project objectives (defined based on necessity) will represent a noticeable contribution to the objectives defined under the call (i.e. support for the intensification of long-term interdisciplinary cooperation between sectors, or support for the establishment and development of partnerships between ROs and the application sector). Expected benefit of the project should correspond with research sectors identified and described by the applicant. An assessment is made of whether an overall progress in the relevant issue and the corresponding objectives have been defined.</p> <p>In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.</p>	<p>The applicant describes the impact, main benefits and purpose of the project:</p> <p>5 to 4 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The method to address the problem / achieve the project objectives and project impact/contribution are consistent with the description of the project's necessity; it is clearly and sufficiently described. Expected benefits of the project are described specifically.</p> <p>3 to 2 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The expected benefits are described in general terms. The justification is substantiated only partially and/or only partially corresponds with the project plan. Proposals / methods to address exhibit shortcomings which do not threaten project feasibility. Although the necessity of the project is justified in general terms, it corresponds with the current situation in the field.</p> <p>1 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. Expected benefits of the project are not convincingly described and/or only declarative phrases are given, and/or its achievement does not seem very realistic.</p>
<p>An assessment is made of the proposed manner of specific implementation of the project, the technical quality and content of the project (or its individual activities). The activities must be planned in line with the objectives and conditions of the call.</p>	<p>application for support: – Project description – Key activities</p> <p>annexes to the application for support: - feasibility study</p> <p>Opinion of an external expert</p>	<p>An assessment is made of the proposed manner of specific implementation of the project, the technical quality and content of the project (or its individual activities). The activities must be planned in line with the objectives and conditions of the call.</p> <p>The planned activities of the project must be specifically described and linked to the project budget (including all mandatory activities set in the call). The setting and description of the project activities is the pivotal indicator of the future project implementation, the achievement of indicators and goals of the project, including its benefit and overall meaningfulness.</p> <p>In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.</p>	<p>10 points – The activities proposed are fully appropriate to the project objectives, they are sufficiently described, their relation to budget items can be evaluated and related outcomes can be identified.</p> <p>9 to 7 points – Activities correspond to the project objectives, but the evaluator has partial objections (relation to budget items, outputs, etc.).</p> <p>6 to 4 points – the evaluator has strong objections (relation to budget items, outputs, etc.).</p> <p>3 to 0 points – Activities are non-transparent, described insufficiently and in very general terms, the relation between the activities and the budget cannot be identified / is insufficient. Proposed activities threaten the feasibility of the project.</p>

V3.4	feasibility	<b>Timetable and logical consistency of project activities</b>	combined	5	2
V3.5	feasibility	<b>Risk management – preparedness for possible risks and addressing them</b>	combined	5	2
V3.6	effectiveness/efficiency	<b>Potential of long-term cooperation between the research organization and entities from application sector</b>	combined	10	4
V3.7	necessity	<b>Quality of research plans</b>	combined	15	5

5	2
5	2
10	4
15	5

Assessing whether the proposed schedule of activities is logically and realistically set.	application for support: – key activities – public contracts  Annexes to the application for support: - schedule of key activities - feasibility study  Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of whether the proposed schedule of activities is logically and realistically set. An assessment is made of whether the sequence of the implemented activities is suitably designed with regard to the possibilities of the applicant (project team).  The evaluation must also include the planned tenders, i.e. whether corresponding tenders are planned in accordance with the project budget (or whether it has been justified why no tenders are planned, e.g. because a framework agreement has been concluded) and how those tenders are in accordance with the schedule of activities (i.e. whether sufficient time has been allocated for large tenders, etc.).  In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	The applicant describes the schedule and logical coherence of project activities as follows:  5 to 4 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. Project activities are logically coherent and time allocated to each key activity is adequate.  3 to 2 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The proposed schedule has shortcomings in the coherence of, and/or time allocation for, activities.  1 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The proposed schedule does not allow smooth implementation of the project; it has been set unrealistically. Setting of the schedule is illogical and threatens the feasibility of the project.
An assessment is made of whether the project reflects the existence of risks in implementing the activities and in the financial and operational management of the project.	application for support: - Project description  annexes to the application for support: - feasibility study	An assessment is made of whether the project <b>reflects the existence of risks</b> in implementing the activities and in the financial and operational management of the project. It is also necessary for the project to contain <b>methods of risk prevention and proposals of measures</b> to eliminate such risks. The purpose of the criterion is to assess to what extent the applicant realises the risks and what mechanisms will be used to eliminate them, or what steps will be taken if problems arise.	The applicant has described risk management as follows:  5 to 4 points – Excellent or very well; the shortcomings, if any, are partial or, further improvements are possible. The risks are complete.  3 to 2 points – Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. Some risks are missing, or the plan for their prevention and elimination is incomplete.  1 to 0 points – Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. No significant risks are defined.
An assessment is made of the extent to which project implementation demonstrably leads to a two-way transfer of unique knowledge and experience of each entity – linking research-application problems with options provided by the latest research findings.	application for support:  annexes to application for support: - Feasibility study - Partnership Agreement - Partnership principles  Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of the extent to which project implementation demonstrably leads to a two-way transfer of unique knowledge and experience of each entity – linking research-application problems with options provided by the latest research findings. This should not involve mere completion of application sector products, or merely address product-oriented solutions to problems without research benefit for the research organization.  Furthermore, evaluators evaluate the quality and intensity of mutual cooperation on joint research projects, including the regulation of access to the results and outputs, the setting of cooperation system, etc. The cooperation strategy should reflect all the activities selected by the applicant (if creation of a joint centre is selected, assessment is made of the nature and form of cooperation within this centre; in the case of involvement of application sector representatives in education, assessment is made of the form and extent of involvement, etc.).  In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of an external expert.	The applicant has described the cooperation between the research organization and application sector entities as follows:  10 to 8 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. It is a partnership which will demonstrably lead to a two-way transfer of unique knowledge and experience of each entity, thus linking research-application problems with options provided by the latest research findings.  7 to 4 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. Some risks are missing, or the plan for their prevention and elimination is incomplete. It is a partnership which does not always lead to a two-way transfer of unique knowledge and experience of each entity, thus linking research-application problems with options provided by the latest research findings.  3 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. It is a cooperation whose nature is rather one of contract research, or when a partner from the application sector is not involved in the research plans.
An assessment is made of the quality of the submitted research plans and their activities at international scale, i.e. the extent to which the proposed research plans have scientific potential to produce results equivalent to the results of relevant types of institutions abroad.	application for support :  annexes to application for support: - feasibility study  Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of the quality of the submitted research plans and their activities at international scale, i.e. the extent to which the proposed research plans have scientific potential to produce results equivalent to the results of relevant types of institutions abroad. In addition, an assessment is made of the timeliness and relevance of the topics addressed, taking into account the current state of research in the field.  In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	The quality of the submitted research plans and their activities has been described:  15 to 13 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. This is a good research plan comparable in international context.  12 to 9 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The quality of the plan is volatile, the outputs are below the expected level.  8 to 5 points: Weak or insufficient, there are serious shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The research plan cannot be compared in international context, quality of outputs is low.  4 to 0 points: Irrelevant – absent and incomplete information in the description of the research plan.

	V3.8	efficiency	Evaluation of interdisciplinarity	evaluation	5	x				An assessment is made of the extent to which the research objectives of the project represent current and relevant inter-disciplinary issues. i.e. addressing current scientific issues of an interdisciplinary nature.	application for support: – List of expertise profiles under the project  annexes to the application for support: - feasibility study	An assessment is made of the extent to which the research objectives of the project represent current and relevant inter-disciplinary issues. i.e. addressing current scientific issues of an interdisciplinary nature.	5 points – The project includes interdisciplinary cooperation  0 points – The project does not include interdisciplinary cooperation
Results and outputs	V4.1	efficiency	Suitability, specification, appropriateness and feasibility of the selected result and output indicators	combined	10	10	4	4		Consideration is given to whether or not the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen. An assessment is made of the appropriateness of the setting of quantified indicators for planned project activities. An assessment is made of the unambiguous specification and description of the key outputs to contribute to the indicators.	application for support: – indicators  annexes to application for support: - an overview of key outputs to contribute to the ERDF indicators - feasibility study	Consideration is given to whether or not the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen.  An assessment is made of the appropriateness of the setting of quantified indicators for planned project activities. Specifically, an assessment is made of whether it is realistic to achieve the set indicator values and whether they are appropriate with regard to the objectives, schedule and budget of the project.  An assessment is made of how the initial and target indicator values are determined. An assessment is made of whether the key outputs for the achievement of indicators are unambiguously specified and described; the applicant must specify the key outputs in the annex to the application for support.	The applicant has described the area related to the results and outputs as follows:  10 to 8 points: Excellent or very well; any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The applicant has clearly and comprehensively specified project outputs. The description of the project shows that indicators correspond to the selected activities and lead to the achievement of results/outputs. The value of the proposed indicators is proportionate to the proposed activities and the probability of achieving them is high.  7 to 4 points: Well or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. Specification of the project outputs is not clearly described. The value of the proposed indicators is proportionate to the proposed activities and they can be expected to be achieved. The evaluator has found an error in their calculation. Adjustment is needed in the values of monitoring indicators.  3 to 0 points: Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the project does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. Specification of the project outputs is insufficient/incomprehensible. Selected activities and values are not in accordance with the indicators, they are set ambiguously, disproportionately, improperly or unrealistically and/or the description of the project makes it impossible to tell what indicators should be monitored.
Funding of the project	V5.1	effectiveness/efficiency/economy	Adequacy and consistency of the budget with the contents and scope of the project	combined	25	15	5	10		An assessment is made of whether the size of the budget and the particular budget items are duly justified with regard to the duration of the project, the content of the activities, and the planned results/outputs. An assessment is made of the appropriateness of the project budget, i.e. respecting the 3E rule (economy, efficiency and effectiveness). An assessment is made of the clarity of the budget.	application for support: – budget  annexes to application for support: - feasibility study, including annexes	(a) an assessment is made of the <b>justification of the budget size and individual budget items</b> given the duration of the project, content of activities, planned results/outputs in relation to the research part of the project.  (b) the <b>appropriateness of the project budget</b> means respecting the 3E rule – economy, efficiency and effectiveness in terms of financial costs in relation to the implementation of the planned activities, planned outputs and results following the research part of the project. It is necessary to assess mainly: - Appropriateness of <b>labour costs/FTEs for the project team</b> with respect to the quality (proficiency) of its work and the duration of its activities. - If the applicant intends to implement the project also through external suppliers, it must be assessed whether <b>the procured goods, services or works</b> will be utilised in the project, whether they are not redundant for the project implementation or whether the parameters of the procured goods and services are not disproportionate. - <b>Appropriateness of the leased premises</b> given the needs of the project. - <b>appropriateness of the quantity and parameters of the procured IT equipment.</b> - <b>Proportionality of the budget chapters</b> within the budget (e.g. proportionality of purchasing the equipment for the project team and FTEs of project team members). - Whether the particular items correspond to prices typical at the place and time.- Whether the particular items correspond to prices set using a procedure recommended by the MA in the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries or in the Call. The appropriateness and technical correctness need to be assessed both for the project budget items, or groups of items, and for the budget as a whole to avoid assessing only some parts of the budget while other parts are not considered.  (c) An assessment is made of <b>budget clarity</b> – clarity of the breakdown of costs into items and groups and the degree of their concretization. If the evaluator concludes that the justification is unclear or the amount inadequate, he/she is obliged to propose cuts, while respecting any budget limits laid down in the call / follow-up documentation.	15 points: The budget is reasonable, parameters of procured supplies are adequate, prices can be considered normal, budget items are linked to individual activities, they enable a reliable assessment of costs-effectiveness, no adjustment of the budget is proposed.  14 to 11 points: The budget is reasonable save for minor objections, there is a limited number of items that are not directly justified in the description of the project and/or their procured volume/quantity does not match the description (the needs of the project); only a small-scale adjustment is proposed (roughly up to 5% of the total budget).  10 to 7 points: The budget is slightly overvalued or undervalued, there are items that lack clear and good justification and/or the purchased volume/quantity does not match the description (needs) of the project. A reduction is proposed (indicatively 5–20% of the total budget).  6 to 5 points: The budget is overvalued or undervalued, there is a larger number of items that are not justified, a significant reduction is proposed (indicatively 20–40% of the total budget).  3 to 1 points: The budget is significantly overvalued or undervalued; the 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.
	V5.2	efficiency	General conditions for the eligibility of expenditure	evaluation	5	x				Assessment is made of the budget from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, i.e. substantive, local and temporal eligibility of expenditure in the budget.	application for support: – budget – key activities – project description  Annexes to application for support:  - feasibility study	Assessment is made of the budget from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, i.e. substantive, local and temporal eligibility of expenditure in the budget. If the application for support contains ineligible expenditure, the evaluator shall propose its removal from the budget. If it is not possible to remove the ineligible expenditure from the budget (i.e. the project would not be feasible), it is not possible to recommend the approval of the application for support.	5 to 4 points: The budget is fully in line with the eligibility rules.  3 to 2 points: The budget contains ineligible costs, which can be eliminated from the budget based on evaluator's objection.  1 to 0 points: The budget contains ineligible costs, which cannot be eliminated from the budget while maintaining project feasibility. Here, the evaluator should focus on substantive coherence/necessity to purchase relevant equipment given the project activities or e.g. whether the purchase of this equipment is not redundant.





Min. score to advance to the next stage of the approval process	75								
Min. score of overall evaluation by two evaluators for arbitrator involvement	26								