

Annex No. 2 Call Excellent Research - Formal check - 1., 2. round

sequence	criterion name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	evaluation method - 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	yes/no	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	internal evaluator/MS2014+	Inspected at the stage of finalization of the grant application automatically, no need to check by the evaluator.	MS2014+ - Automatic check for fields set as mandatory
F3	All required annexes are proven 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 grant application was submitted in the English language, in accordance with the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries - Specific section, ch. 18.10.	a) This criterion is met if the grant application including all obligatory/optional annexes (according to the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries - Specific section, chap. 18.10) was presented in Czech and English. b) This criterion is not met if the grant application or any of the obligatory/optional annexes (according to the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries - Specific section, chap. 18.10) was not presented in Czech or English.
F5	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	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. a) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the applicant is included in the grant application. b) It is evaluated, whether the applicant's 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+
F6	Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	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, annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	<p>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.</p> <p>a) It is evaluated, whether the application is electronically signed by the statutory body or an authorized person delegated by the statutory body of the applicant/partner subject, i.e. whether the signature matches the statutory body/authorized of the applicant/partner subject.</p> <p><b>Documents can also be signed (documents must not be older than 90 calendar days from the date of grant application submission in IS KP14+):</b></p> <p>1) By another agent 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.</p> <p>2) By an authorized person on the basis of a mandate to be represented by the statutory body of the applicant/partner 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+.</p>	<p>a) cannot be finalized without a signature, automatically checked by MS2014+</p> <p>b) evaluator - signature relevancy check</p> <p>Formalities of the power of attorney:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• principal clearly identified - the one who grants the power of attorney,</li> <li>• Agent clearly identified - the one who the the power of attorney is granted,</li> <li>• putting a legal act or acts for which the principal authorizes the agent,</li> <li>• the period for which the authorization is valid,</li> <li>• date and place of signing the power of attorney,</li> <li>• signatures of principal and agent.</li> </ul>
F8	Estimated time of project implementation is in compliance with the call terms	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether the length of the project implementation (number of months) and the period of project implementation (from-to) correspond to the call terms.</p>	<p>a) This criterion is met if the duration of the project is in line with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call, while the project implementation period is in line with the call.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the duration of the project is not in line with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call or the project implementation period is not in line with the call.</p>
F9	The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application (budget)	internal evaluator/MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether the request respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call and the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries.</p>	<p>a) This criterion is met if the budget is set in compliance with all financial 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 funding limits in the call.</p>
F10	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	internal evaluator/MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether in the grant application the applicant's own resources are included, in compliance with the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries and the wording of the call.</p>	<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>
F11	Requested state aid respects the conditions laid down in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	<p>The compliance with the conditions and limits laid down for such support by EC law is evaluated and whether state aid is compatible with the internal market. The criterion will be met if the state aid respects the threshold and the way of providing state aid defined in the call.</p>	<p>a) The criterion is met if the state aid respects the threshold and the way of providing state aid defined in the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met if the state aid does not respect the threshold and the way of providing state aid defined in the call.</p>



F12	<b>Support de minimis respects the conditions laid down in the call</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the support de minimis respects the threshold and method of support de minimis as defined in the given call.	<p>a) The criterion is met, if the support de minimis respects the conditions laid down in the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met, if the support de minimis does not respect the conditions laid down in the call.</p>
F13	<b>Financial health/Annual organization turnover/ of the applicant's company</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	<p>Organization/applicant company annual turnover reaches at least one-half of the amount of eligible project expenditures specified in the grant application.</p> <p>For other conditions, see Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries - Specific section, chap. 5.2.1.</p>	<p>a) The criterion is met if the applicant demonstrates the fin. health/turnover in compliance with the terms of the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met if the applicant does not demonstrate the fin. health/turnover in compliance with the terms of the call.</p>



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Call Excellent Research –Eligibility check - 1., 2. round

sequence	aspect project quality	criterion name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	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 annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the project objectives and activities correspond to the call requirements. It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted all the required activities according to the text of the call and that the grant application does not include an excluded activity according to the call definition.  Only pertinent for the 2nd round of evaluation: It shall be evaluated, whether the application is a complete grant application, as a follow-up to a successful preliminary grant application submitted for the first round.	a) This criterion is met if the project 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.  b) The criterion is not met if the project 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.
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	grant application: - subjects  annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	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.  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) and also does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries.  IS KP14+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the applicant.
P4	feasibility	The project partner meets the conditions of eligibility of a partner	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application  annexes	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 for Applicants and Beneficiaries 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 for Applicants and Beneficiaries OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.  MS2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the partner.



P5	feasibility	<b>Place of implementation and place of impact of the project in compliance with the terms of the call</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Location - Key activities - Project description  annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the place of implementation and place of impact of the project are 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 and place of implementation from a present 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.  b) This criterion is not met if the project has not an impact only on the territory according to the call.
P6	Feasibility/eff ectiveness	<b>Project activities are unique for applicants/partners</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Project description - Key activities  annexes  (MS2014+ database outputs OP EC/OP RDE)	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. 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 beneficiaries in the OP EC/OP RDI database outputs.	a) This criterion is met if the project activities are unique for the applicant/partner, 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 project or another OP EC /OP RDI project.
P7	feasibility	<b>Documented involvement of the partner in compliance with the call</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application  annexes	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.
P8	expediency	<b>The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of total eligible expenditures determined in the call</b>	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application - budget	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the total eligible expenditures correspond to the conditions of the call.	a) This criterion is met if the total amount of eligible expenditures corresponds to the conditions of the call.  b) This criterion is not met if the total amount of eligible expenditures does not correspond to the conditions of the call.



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Call Excellent Research –Objective evaluation, 1. round

activity	root criterion name	quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion	sub-criterion number	sub-criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion	point evaluation on root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	min. point border in case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined sub-criteria	min. point spread of the evaluator's for the use of an arbitrator root criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
a,d,e,f	applicant/partner	feasibility	V1.1	Existing research centre	yes/no	yes/no	grant application: - Project description - Key activities  annexes: - Feasibility study	external evaluator/arbitrator	exclusion	exclusion	x	x	x	Is the applicant clearly profiled as a place of research and development (R&D), which is an active research entity?	Are the main activities of the R&D Centre activities in the field of R&D? Has it been implementing its research and development activities during the last 2 years (2014-2015)? Is the R&D Centre clearly profiled as a place, which centralizes research goals, with clearly defined content and research goals? Does the program of the research centre combine research, development and education (of mainly doctorate-level students and young research workers)?
a,d,e,f	Applicant's plan to develop the relevant R&D Centre by means of the project	expediency	V2.1	The ambitiousness (and simultaneously feasibility) of the research centre development plan of the applicant in the areas of R&D relevant to the research objectives of the project	5	5	annexes: - Feasibility study - Activities to achieve the target state		evaluating	evaluating	x	x	4	The plan of development of the R&D Centre will be evaluated by its research capabilities/capacity, investment capabilities and international cooperation in R&D.	Evaluate, based on the description of the original and proposed conditions and planned development activities, the extent to which the development plan of the research centre is feasible. Take into consideration, whether or not the original and proposed conditions are specific enough. Provided that the development plan of the research centre is in fact feasible, evaluate the extent to which such a plan is ambitious. Take into consideration the extent to which the research goals of the research centre are in compliance with the development plan of the research centre in relevant areas of R&D.
a,d,e,f	project research agenda	usefulness	V3.1	Quality and potential of the project's research program/programs	10	45	annexes: - Feasibility study		combined	combined	25	6	34	If the project's intentions contribute to increasing the quality of current research intentions or to the quality of new research intentions on a global scale, what will the project's intentions contribute in the given area of R&D on a global scale.	To what extent do the research goals of the project represent contemporary and relevant multidisciplinary matters – deal with contemporary scientific problems of multidisciplinary nature? Take into consideration the current state of affairs of contemporary research in the relevant discipline and the level to which research goals are specific, in order to facilitate for a verification of their fulfillment. To what extent can the proposed research programs potentially produce scientific output, which comparable to scientific output of similar institutions abroad? To what extent is oriented research a topic of the research agenda - research to create knowledge with the potential to produce relevant applicable results?
a,d,e,f		usefulness	V3.2	Quality and potential research project's activities	10		grant application:  annexes:			evaluating		x		Whether such research activities are beneficial and relevant to research program(s) and whether they contribute to the development and quality of research programs	Are the research activities described clearly and specifically enough? Are the research activities real and relevant with regard to the research programs? To what extent are the research activities qualitatively adequate? To what extent do the proposed activities contribute to the production of proposed scientific output in the appropriate research programs?





a,d,e,f		efficiency	V3.3	Cooperation with leading research organizations/foreign partner	5		grant application:  annexes: contract (e.g. MoU), cooperation on research projects (with a research organization or entity of the business sector); grant application (feasibility study)		evaluating		x		has it been proven that the research team co-operates and will co-operate with leading foreign research organizations actively and on a long-term basis which is the subject of grant application? The quality of the research organization abroad is evaluated by means of comparison with relevant institutions abroad.	Is there international co-operation with leading research organizations abroad? To what extent do the activities and successes of such activities of international co-operation of the research centre correspond to the level of relevant institutions abroad? Take into consideration the character and extent of such activities, as well as the qualitative level of the main foreign partners. Do what extent does the research centre make use of international co-operation projects' potential for its own development?
a,d,e,f		efficiency	V3.4	Way of involving the foreign strategic partner in the research project activities	5		grant application: Annexes:		evaluating		x		the specifics of co-operation with a foreign strategic partner is described and such co-operation is evaluated with regard to the goals of the project	How does the foreign strategic partner contribute to/participate in the research activities of the project? Is that partner's participation feasible, relevant and appropriate with regard to their field of expertise? Is that partner's participation relevant and appropriate with regard to the research programs and activities of the project? Is that partner's participation a contribution to the project? Will the project help facilitate further/wider co-operation between the partner and the applicant?
a,d,e,f		efficiency	V3.5	Logical sequence and thematic compliance of research objectives of the project with respect to the existing research activities of the applicant's research centre	5		annexes: - Feasibility study		combined		2		it is described whether the focus of the project's research plan corresponds to the prior research activities plans of the applicant and how it connects to them	To what extent are the research objectives and research programs and activities of the project complementary to existing research activities in the research centre? 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 programs and activities of the project with the existing research activities of the research centre?
a,d,e,f		efficiency / effectiveness	V3.6	Ambitiousness of the outcome and results of the project and how feasible is its completion in time of the project milestones.	10		grant application: - Indicators  annexes: - Feasibility study - Overview of key outputs to fulfil indicators of ERDF projects		evaluating		x		The project is evaluated based on feasibility and ambitious its output and results are considered	Evaluate how feasible the accomplishment of planned output and results is with regard to the project's timeline of milestones. Evaluate, whether the description of proposed output and results is specific enough, in order to facilitate verification of accomplishment. Provided that the output and results of the project are feasible enough, evaluate the extent to which such output and results are ambitious. Evaluate the extent to which the accomplishment of proposed indicator targets is feasible. Provided that the proposed indicator targets are feasible enough, evaluate the extent to which such targets are ambitious. Take into consideration the extent to which the project's results are relevant with regard to research agenda and the extent to which such results correspond to research goals, research programs and the project's activities.
a,d,e,f	staffing	feasibility	V4.1	Results of the specialized team achieved in the last 5 years in terms of scientific publications and/or monographs.	5	40	annexes: - Feasibility study - Description of research activities	combined	evaluating	21	x	30	The period of 2011 to 2015 will be evaluated. The results of key and/or excellent members of the academic team will be evaluated. The applicant shall provide a list of 5 most significant results with regard to the project's research agenda.	Taking into consideration the Impact Factor of the relevant periodical, in which such results were published, evaluate the extent to which such periodicals are considered leading in the relevant field. To what extent does the amount of citations (exclusive of auto-citations) of such results correspond to leading publications in the relevant field? Evaluate the extent to which this publication contributed to a significant advancement (break-through) in the relevant field.



a,d,e,f	feasibility	V4.2	Results of the specialized team achieved in the last 5 years in terms of gaining grant resources.	5	annexes: - Feasibility study - Description of research activities	evaluating	x	The period of 2011 to 2015 will be evaluated. The results of key and/or excellent members of the academic team will be evaluated. The applicant shall provide a list of 5 most significant results with regard to the project's research agenda.	To what extent does the success in obtaining grant funding correspond to the success of leading research teams in the relevant field? Take into account the difficulty of grant competition, in which the given key and/or excellent member of the academic team has succeeded and the amount of grant funded that was awarded.
a,d,e,f	feasibility	V4.3	Results of the specialized team achieved in the last 5 years in terms of patents and co-operation with industry.	5	annexes: - Feasibility study - Description of research activities	evaluating	x	The period of 2011 to 2015 will be evaluated. The results of key and/or excellent members of the academic team will be evaluated. The applicant shall provide a list of 5 most significant results with regard to the project's research agenda.	To what extent does success of a given key and/or excellent member of the academic team with regard to obtaining patents and co-operating with the industry correspond to the success of leading scientists / research teams in the relevant field? Take into consideration, whether such patents are commercially used in the relevant industry. Take into consideration, whether such co-operation with the industry led to commercial use of the accomplished results.
a,d,e,f	feasibility	V4.4	Concept and size of the research team, balance of expertise, roles, employment contracts and their relevance to achieving research activities of the project and development of the team during conducting the project.	10	annexes: - Feasibility study - Description of the research activities of the nominated team members	combined	2	Concept and size of the research team is evaluated. The research team is defined in the description of activity d) calls, i.e. local or foreign research or technical employees.	To what extent does the concept of the research team correspond to needs for executing the research agenda? Take into consideration balancing expertise and roles in the team, together with allocated employment contracts for the roles. To what extent are expertise, roles and employment contracts in the team relevant to the aims of the research and activities of the research agenda?
a,d,e,f	feasibility	V4.5	Quality of the nominated members of the research team, relevance of their previous research activities and its interconnection to research activities of the project.	10	grant application: - Indicators annexes: - Feasibility study - research team CV - Description of the research activities of the nominated team members	combined	4	Quality of members of the research team is evaluated. The research team is defined in the description of activity d) calls, i.e. local or foreign research or technical employees. In the grant application the applicant will list leading researchers of the research team (by names or by means of a list of requirements regarding professional expertise and experience required for the position). Leading researcher is meant to be the researcher who leads and is responsible for the research programme. An annex to the grant application includes CVs of researchers listed by names (including description of their experience).	To what extent is the H-index value of nominated members of the research team comparable with other very good scientists in their research field? Decide if journals, in which the nominated members published their 8 best publications, are considered high quality journals, taking into consideration the IF of the journals. To what extent are previous research activities of the nominated members of the research team relevant to research aims, agenda and activities of the project? Take into consideration how interconnected previous research activities of the nominated members of the research team are with the agenda and activities of the project. Consider the potential that previous research activities of the nominated members of the research team have to successfully achieve the aims of the research, agenda and activities of the project.
a,d,e,f	feasibility	V4.6	How feasible are the plan and the time schedule of recruitment of the research employees to the research project.	5	grant application: annexes	combined	1	the plan of research team member recruitment is evaluated.	Is the plan and time schedule for recruiting members of the research team feasible? Do the plan and research member recruitment time schedule correspond to the plan and time schedule for the implementation of research programs and activities of the project?





a,d,e,f	Results and outputs	expediency	V5.1	<b>Appropriateness of selected output indicators and results</b>	5	5	grant application: - Indicators annexes: - Summary of the key outputs of the project fulfilment of indicators - Feasibility study
a,d,e,f	The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project / funding and budget in the implementation and operational phase	economy	V6.1	<b>Adequacy and economy of the labour expenditures of the specialized team (research employees of the specialized team).</b>	15	35	grant application: - Budget - Description of the implementation team  annexes: - Feasibility study - Time schedule of key activities - Implementation team
a,d,e,f		economy	V6.2	<b>Adequacy and economy of the labor expenditures of the administrative team.</b>	5		grant application: - Budget - Description of the implementation team  annexes: - Feasibility study - Time schedule of key activities - Implementation team
a,d,e,f		economy	V6.3	<b>Ambitiousness (and concurrently how feasible is) of amount of income from international grant resources.</b>	5		grant application: - Budget  annexes: - Feasibility study
a,d,e,f		economy	V6.4	<b>How feasible is structure, character, and amount of other income (i.e. income other than income from international grant resources) considering achievement of the aims of the project.</b>	10		grant application: - Budget  annexes: - Feasibility study

combined	combined	2	2	4		It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.  (Assessing the relevance of results and outputs with respect to their practical use.)
combined	evaluating	10	x	26	This applies only to research employees of the specialized team.	To what extent do the labor expenditures of the research employees of the specialized team correspond to needs of the research aims, agenda, and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the labor expenditures correspond to employment contracts of the research employees of the specialized team during the period of conducting the research, regarding the time schedule of the recruitment of employees and beginning of their work. To what extent are salary conditions of the research employees of the specialized team motivating considering national and international competition in the area of human resources for R&D?  In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.
	evaluating		x		This applies only to employees of the administrative team.	To what extent do the labor expenditures of the administrative team correspond to needs of the research aims, agenda, and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the labor expenditures correspond to employment contracts of the administrative team during the period of conducting the research, regarding the time schedule of the recruitment of employees and beginning of their work. To what extent are salary conditions of the administrative team motivating? In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.
	evaluating		x			Consider how feasible is the value of the planned revenue amount from international competition grants. Provided that the value of income amount is feasible enough, evaluate the extent to which such an amount is ambitious. Consider the potential of the research team to obtain grant funding.
	evaluating		x			Consider how feasible is the amount of other income (income beyond the income from international grant competitions). Consider, having regard to information about the structure and nature of research centre funding in the past, how feasible is the planned structure and character of other revenues.



a,d,e,f	financing of the project	expediency	V7.1	<b>General conditions for expenditure eligibility.</b>	5	10	grant application: - Budget
a,d,e,f		economy	V7.2	<b>Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.</b>	5		grant application: - Financial resources summary
a,d,e,f	Risks	efficiency	V8.1	<b>Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact on the ability to achieve aims of the project.</b>	5	5	grant application: - Project description  annexes: - Feasibility study
a,d,e,f	horizontal themes	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V9.1	<b>Activities promoting equal opportunities</b>	yes/no	yes/no	grant application: - Horizontal principles
a,d,e,f		Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V9.2	<b>Activities supporting a sustainable development</b>	yes/no		grant application: - Horizontal principles
a,d,e,f		Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V9.3	<b>Activities supporting non-discrimination</b>	yes/no		grant application: - Horizontal principles

combined	evaluating	2	x	8			The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of expenditure eligibility, i.e. the material, local and temporal eligibility of expenditure in the budget. In the event that the grant application contains an ineligible expenditure, the evaluator proposes its elimination from the budget. In case it is not possible to exclude an ineligible expenditure from the budget (i.e. the project would not be feasible), it is not possible to recommend the grant application
	evaluating		x				It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.
evaluating	evaluating	x	x	4			To what extent are risks of research and implementation 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?
exclusion	exclusion	x	x	x			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.
	exclusion		x	x			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. If applicable: The application shall include an environmental indicator output ("Extended, renovated or newly built capacities without the annexation of agricultural fund.").
	exclusion		x	x			It is evaluated, whether there is no discrimination of certain groups in the project.



a,d,e,f	sustainability	economy	V10.1	sustainability	5	5	grant application: - Project description  annexes: - Feasibility study	evaluating	evaluating	x	x	4		The project features sufficiently elaborate plan of expenses and profits that is based on reliable and clearly formulated preconditions, and is designed so that it can be justly assumed that financial sustainability of the project will be ensured even after the project finishes at least for as long as is stated in the call. The project features adequate plan of measures to support sustainability of the activities and outcomes of the project. Financial sustainability of the project is fully guaranteed for the whole period of evaluating the project, stated financial resources and capacity of its utilization were sufficiently justified and achieving it seems feasible. Personal development of the team during the period of sustainability: to what extent is personal development of the research team planned for the period of sustainability? Consider if the plan of development takes into account all possible expansions of the research team as a reaction to achieving the specific outputs and results during the period of sustainability. Consider the if the plan of development of the research team takes into account possible aging of the project team. To what extent is the personal development of the team in compliance with development activities in the area of research capacities of the applicant's research centre. This is relevant for all projects and investments into infrastructure or productive investments, projects supported from EFRR, major projects and other projects where a requirement is defined in the call.
a,d,e,f	Compliance with strategies	expediency	V11.1	It is evaluated, whether the project is with its activities/content in compliance with relevant strategies stated in the text of the call and contributes to their achievement (RIS3).	yes/no	yes/no	grant application: - Project description  annexes: Continuity of project activities to the strategic objectives of the National Strategy RIS3	exclusion	exclusion	x	x	x		It is evaluated, whether the focus of research programs 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.
Max. number of points						150								
Min. number of points to advance to the next stage of the approval process						98								
Min. point spread of the overall evaluation of 2 evaluators to use an arbitrator						30								



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Call Excellent Research –Objective evaluation, 2. round 1. step

activity	root criterion name	quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion	sub-criterion number	sub-criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion	point evaluation of criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	correctable/uncorrectable	min. point border in case of combined root criteria	min. point border in case of combined sub-criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
a - f	Compliance	feasibility	V12.1	The compliance of activities with a simplified grant application and incorporation of reservations from the 1. round	yes/no	x	grant application/annexes	external evaluator evaluating the application for support in the 1. round of the evaluation	exclusion	exclusion	uncorrectable	x	x	x	It is evaluated the compliance of activities with activities listed in the simplified grant application which was the subject of evaluation in the 1. round. It is evaluated, whether reservations from the 1. round of evaluation are incorporated. Factual amendments in the grant application must be made only in relation to the introduction of reservations from the 1. round of evaluations.	Are project activities in compliance with the activities listed in the simplified grant application? Are reservations from the 1. round of evaluation incorporated? There have been factual changes to the project only in relation to the incorporation of objections or recommendations from the 1. round of evaluations.



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Call Excellent Research –Objective evaluation, 2. Round 2. step

activity	root criterion name	quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion	sub-criteria number	sub-criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - partial sub-criterion	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion	point evaluation of criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	Function of the partial sub-criterion	min. point border in case of combined /exclusion root criteria	min. point border in case of combined sub-criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria/partial criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	project research agenda	expediency	V13.1	<b>Necessity and reasonableness of investments to fulfil the research objectives of the project</b>	x	20	20	Annex: - Feasibility study - Project description - Budget - Indicators	external evaluator	combined	combined	x	7	7	15	Criterion applies to constructed, completed, modernized, and upgraded infrastructure.	Consider to what extent are investments to constructing, completion, modernizing, and upgrading infrastructure and facilities necessary to achieving research aims, agenda and activities of the project taking into account current infrastructure and facilities of the research centre. To what extent is necessity of constructing, completion, modernizing, and upgrading infrastructure and facilities sufficiently justified? Consider if the extent of utilization of constructed, completed, modernized and upgraded infrastructure and facilities justifies its acquisition for the purposes of achieving the aims, agenda and activities of the research.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	Results and outputs	expediency	V14.1	<b>Appropriateness of selected output indicators and results</b>	x	5	5	grant application: - Indicators  annexes: Summary of the key outputs of the project fulfilment of indicators - Feasibility study		combined	combined	x	2	2	4		It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.  4-5 points – It is evident from the description of the project that activities correspond to chosen indicators and lead to achieving results / outcome.  1 - 3 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.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project / funding and budget in the implementation and operational phase	economy	V15.1	<b>The adequacy and economy of labor expenditures of the expert team (technical and support staff in R&amp;D).</b>	x	5	25	grant application: - Budget  annexes: - Feasibility study - Time schedule of key activities - Implementation team		combined	evaluating	x	10	x	19	Criterion applies to non-research employees of the specialized team, i.e. technical and support employees in research and development.	To what extent do the labor expenditures of the specialized team correspond to needs of the research aims, agenda, and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the labor expenditures correspond to employment contracts of the specialized team during the period of conducting the research, regarding the time schedule of the recruitment of employees and beginning of their work. To what extent are salary conditions of the specialized team motivating considering national and international competition in the area of human resources for R&D? In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.



b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		economy	V15.2	The adequacy and efficiency of the cost of investment equipment.	x	15		grant application: - Budget - CBA (FA) - Indicators  annexes: - Feasibility study - Summary of the key outputs of the project fulfilment of indicators		evaluating	x		x		Criterion applies to constructed, completed, modernized, and upgraded infrastructure.	To what extent do the expenditures on constructing, completion, modernizing and upgrading 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, finishing, 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.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		economy	V15.3	The adequacy and efficiency of operating expenditures.	x	5		grant application: - Budget - CBA (FA)  annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating	x		x			To what extent do the other operating expenses (beyond labor expenditures) correspond the to needs of the research programs and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Consider, if the expenditures are proportionate to the use of equipment and related infrastructure of the research centre. In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	financing of the project	expediency	V16.1	General conditions for expenditure eligibility.	x	5	10	grant application: - Budget	combined	evaluating	x	2	x	8		The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, 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. In case it is not possible to exclude an ineligible expenditure from the budget (i.e. the project would not be feasible), it is not possible to recommend the grant application.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		economy	V16.2	Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.	x	5		grant application: - Financial resources summary - CBA (FA)		evaluating	x		x			It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	Technical feasibility	effectiveness/efficiency	V17.1	Use of existing applicant's research centre infrastructure for needs of the project.	x	5	25	grant application: - Project description  annexes: - Feasibility study	combined	evaluating	x	10	x	19		To what extent will the existing infrastructure and research centre facilities be used for the implementation of research programs and activities of the project? Consider the effectiveness and efficiency of existing infrastructure and equipment to implement the research agenda.
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		feasibility	V17.2	Investments parameters for implementation of the project research agenda	x	5		grant application: - Project description  annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating	x		x		The technical parameters of equipment clear and feasible? Do the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment correspond to research programs and activities of the project? Are the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment adequate/appropriate in response to the needs of the project implementation and research activities of the project.	Are the parameters of investment in infrastructure and equipment clear and feasible? Do the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment correspond to research programs and activities of the project?





b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		feasibility	V17.3	Plan and time schedule feasibility for procurement procedures for the completion/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure	x	10		Annexes: - Feasibility study - Summary of key outputs to fulfil the ERDF project indicators		evaluating	x		x		By the procurement procedures linked to the completion/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure feasible? Do the mentioned plan and time schedule correspond to research programs and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and time schedule of procurement procedure correspond to the plan and time schedule for the implementation of research programs and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and tender time schedule correspond to the plan and time schedule for the recruitment of workers for the project? Do the plan and tender time schedule for procurement procedure take into account the statutory period with a reasonable time to spare?	
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		efficiency	V17.4	Identification of risks and measures taken to prevent risks and reduce their impact on the ability to achieve aims of the project.	x	5		grant application: - Project description  annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating	x		x		To what extent are risks of research and implementation 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?	
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)	horizontal themes	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V18.1	Activities promoting equal opportunities	x	ano/ne	x	grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion	x	x	x	x	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.	
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V18.2	Activities supporting sustainable development	x	ano/ne		grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion	x		x	x	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: The grant application shall include an environmental indicator ("Extended, refurbished or newly-built capacity without taking agricultural land.")</i>  <i>If applicable: it will be checked if the project is not implemented on plots of land which extend into areas with special protection or areas of the NATURA 2000 system. (http://mapy.nature.cz/, the „mapomat“ application, environment protection section. It is necessary to toggle layers of relevant areas of environment and landscape protection and layers of cadastral maps.)</i>	
b (research/instrumentation on part of the activity)		Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V18.3	Activities supporting non-discrimination	x	ano/ne		grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion	x		x	x	It is evaluated, whether there is no discrimination of certain groups in the project.	



b (research/instrumentation part of the activity)	sustainability	economy	V19.1	sustainability	x	10	10	grant application: - Project description - CBA (FA)  annexes: - Feasibility study	evaluating	evaluating	x	x	x	4		The project features sufficiently elaborate plan of expenses and profits that is based on reliable and clearly formulated preconditions, and is designed so that it can be justly assumed that financial sustainability of the project will be ensured even after the project finishes at least for as long as is stated in the call. The project features adequate plan of measures to support sustainability of the activities and outcomes of the project. Financial sustainability of the project is fully guaranteed for the whole period of evaluating the project, stated financial resources and capacity of its utilization were sufficiently justified and achieving it seems feasible. Personal development of the team during the period of sustainability: to what extent is personal development of the research team planned for the period of sustainability? Consider if the plan of development takes into account all possible expansions of the research team as a reaction to achieving the specific outputs and results during the period of sustainability. Consider the if the plan of development of the research team takes into account possible aging of the project team. To what extent is the personal development of the team in compliance with development activities in the area of research capacities of the applicant's research centre.
b (research/instrumentation part of the activity)	CBA	economy	V20.1	CBA	x	5	5	grant application: CBA (EA)		evaluating	evaluating	x	x	x	4	The grant application is evaluated by cost and revenue analysis (socio-economic analysis) provided by the applicant in the cost and CBA module in IS KP14+. 5points - 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 4-1 points - 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. 0 points - negative result of the socio-economic analysis of the project (negative net present value of the project or internal rate of return lower than the applied discount rate) or inputs of the economic evaluation of the application are not sufficiently justified and appear unrealistic.
Max. number of points							100									
Min. number of points to advance to the next stage of the approval							65									
Min. point spread of the overall evaluation of 2 evaluators to use							20									



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Call Excellent Research –Objective evaluation, 2. Round 3. step

activity	root criterion name	quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion	sub-criteria number	sub-criterion name	partial sub-criterion name	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - partial sub-criterion	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion	point evaluation of criterion	main source of information	evaluator	root criterion function	sub-criterion function	Function of the partial sub-criterion	min. point border in case of combined /exclusion root criteria	min. point border in case of combined sub-criteria	min. point border in case of combined partial sub-criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria/partial criteria	criteria description	Instructions for evaluators
c, b (building part of the activity)	Building research centre	expediency	V21.1	project research agenda	Necessity and reasonableness of investments to fulfil the research objectives of the project	20	20	yes/no	Annex: - Feasibility study	external evaluator	exclusion	combined	combined	65	7	7	15	Criterion applies to constructed, completed, modernized, and upgraded infrastructure.	Consider to what extent are investments to constructing, completion, modernizing, and upgrading infrastructure and facilities necessary to achieving research aims, agenda and activities of the project taking into account current infrastructure and facilities of the research centre. To what extent is necessity of constructing, completion, modernizing, and upgrading infrastructure and facilities sufficiently justified? Consider if the extent of utilization of constructed, completed, modernized and upgraded infrastructure and facilities justifies its acquisition for the purposes of achieving the aims, agenda and activities of the research.
c, b (building part of the activity)		expediency	V21.2	Results and outputs	Appropriateness of selected output indicators and results	5	5		grant application: - indicators  Annexes: - Summary of key outputs to fulfil the ERDF project indicators - Feasibility study			combined	combined		2	2	4		It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.  4-5 points – It is evident from the description of the project that activities correspond to chosen indicators and lead to achieving results / outcome.  1 - 3 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 it cannot even be evaluated which indicators should be monitored.
c, b (building part of the activity)		economy	V21.3	The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project / funding and budget in the implementation and operational phase	The adequacy and economy of labor expenditures of the expert team (technical and support staff in R&D).	5	25		grant application: - budget  Annexes: - Feasibility study - Time schedule of key activities			combined	evaluating		10	x	19	Criterion applies to non-research employees of the specialized team, i.e. technical and support employees in research and development.	To what extent do the labor expenditures of the specialized team correspond to needs of the research aims, agenda, and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the labor expenditures correspond to employment contracts of the specialized team during the period of conducting the research, regarding the time schedule of the recruitment of employees and beginning of their work. To what extent are salary conditions of the specialized team motivating considering national and international competition in the area of human resources for R&D? In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.



c, b (building part of the activity)	economy	V21.4		The adequacy and efficiency of the cost of investment equipment.	15		grant application: - budget - CBA (FA)  Annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating		x		Criterion applies to constructed, completed, modernized, and upgraded infrastructure.	completion, modernizing and upgrading 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, finishing, 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.
c, b (building part of the activity)	economy	V21.5		The adequacy and efficiency of operating expenditures.	5		grant application: - budget - CBA (FA)  Annexes: - Feasibility study		evaluating		x			To what extent do the other operating expenses (beyond labor expenditures) correspond the to needs of the research programs and activities to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Consider, if the expenditures are proportionate to the use of equipment and related infrastructure of the research centre. In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.
c, b (building part of the activity)	expediency	V21.6	financing of the project	General conditions for expenditure eligibility.	5	10	grant application: - budget		combined	evaluating	2	x	8	The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, 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. In case it is not possible to exclude an ineligible expenditure from the budget (i.e. the project would not be feasible), it is not possible to recommend the grant application.
c, b (building part of the activity)	economy	V21.7		Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.	5		grant application: - Overview of sources of financing - CBA (FA)			evaluating		x		It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.
c, b (building part of the activity)	expediency efficiency	V21.8	Technical feasibility	Use of existing applicant's research centre infrastructure for needs of the project.	5	30	grant application: - project description  Annexes: - Feasibility study		combined	evaluating	13	x	23	To what extent will the existing infrastructure and research centre facilities be used for the implementation of research programs and activities of the project? Consider the effectiveness and efficiency of existing infrastructure and equipment to implement the research agenda.
c, b (building part of the activity)	Feasibility	V21.9		Investments parameters for implementation of the project research agenda	10		grant application: - project description  Annexes: - Feasibility study			evaluating		x		The technical parameters of investments are evaluated adequate/appropriate in response to the needs of the project implementation and research activities of the project.  Are the parameters of investment in infrastructure and equipment clear and feasible? Do the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment correspond to research programs and activities of the project? Are the mentioned parameters of investments in infrastructure and equipment adequate to the needs of research programs and activities of the project?



c, b (building part of the activity)	Feasibility	V21.10		Plan and time schedule feasibility for procurement procedures for the completion/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure	10		Annexes: - Summary of key outputs to fulfil the ERDF project indicators - Feasibility study		evaluating		x		By procurement procedures linked to the Summary of the key outputs to fulfill the ERDF project indicators will be evaluated.	Is the plan and time schedule for procurement procedure for the completion/modernization/upgrade of infrastructure feasible? Do the mentioned plan and time schedule correspond to research programs and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and time schedule of procurement procedure correspond to the plan and time schedule for the implementation of research programs and activities of the project? Do the mentioned plan and tender time schedule correspond to the plan and time schedule for the recruitment of workers for the project? Do the plan and tender time schedule for procurement procedure take into account the statutory period with a reasonable time to spare?
c, b (building part of the activity)	efficiency	V21.11		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 research and implementation 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?
c, b (building part of the activity)	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V21.12	horizontal themes	Activities promoting equal opportunities	ano/ne	x	grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion	x	x	x		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.
c, b (building part of the activity)	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V21.13		Activities supporting sustainable development	ano/ne		grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion		x	x		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. If applicable: The grant application shall include an environmental indicator ("Extended, refurbished or newly-built capacity without taking agricultural land."). If applicable: it will be checked if the project is not implemented on plots of land which extend into areas with special protection or areas of the NATURA 2000 system. ( <a href="http://mapy.nature.cz/">http://mapy.nature.cz/</a> , the „mapomat“ application, environment protection section. It is necessary to toggle layers of relevant areas of environment and landscape protection and layers of cadastral maps.)
c, b (building part of the activity)	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V21.14		Activities supporting non-discrimination	ano/ne		grant application: - Horizontal principles	exclusion	exclusion		x	x		It is evaluated, whether there is no discrimination of certain groups in the project..



c, b (building part of the activity)	economy	V21.15	sustainability	sustainability	5	5	grant application: - project description - CBA (FA)  Annexes: - Feasibility study	evaluating	evaluating	x	x	4	The project features sufficiently elaborate plan of expenses and profits that is based on reliable and clearly formulated preconditions, and is designed so that it can be justly assumed that financial sustainability of the project will be ensured even after the project finishes at least for as long as is stated in the call. The project features adequate plan of measures to support sustainability of the activities and outcomes of the project. Financial sustainability of the project is fully guaranteed for the whole period of evaluating the project, stated financial resources and capacity of its utilization were sufficiently justified and achieving it seems feasible. Personal team development in sustainability period. Consider if the plan of development takes into account all possible expansion of the research team as a reaction to possible aging of the project team. To what extent is the personal development of the team in compliance with development activities in the area of research capacities of the applicant's research centre. This is relevant for all projects and investments into infrastructure or productive investments, projects supported from EFRR, major projects and other projects in case where a requirement is defined in the call.
c, b (building part of the activity)	economy	V21.16	CBA	CBA	5	5	grant application: - CBA (EA)	evaluating	evaluating	x	x	4	The grant application is evaluated by cost and revenue analysis (socio-economic analysis) provided by the applicant in the cost and CBA module in IS KP14+. 5points - 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 4-1 points - 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. 0 points - negative result of the socio-economic analysis of the project (negative net present value of the project or internal rate of return lower than the applied discount rate) or inputs of the economic evaluation of the application are not sufficiently justified and appear unrealistic.

