Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Pre-Application Research" – formal check										
criterion code	**Project quality aspect**	**criterion name**	**position**	**correctable / non-correctable**	**evaluation method (yes/no, irrelevant)**	**Evaluator / MS2014+**	**brief criterion description**	**main source of information**	**criterion 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	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 application for support are filled.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	MS2014+	x	application for support	Check is made whether the data in the field correspond to the field's substantive focus.	(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	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 application for support 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 application for support form in IS KP14+.	(a) MS2014+ – an automatic check, the application for support cannot be submitted to the MA without a signature (b) evaluator – checks signature relevance Elements of a 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.
F9	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.
F10	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.
F11	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	application for support, annexes – 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.
F12	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 / fin. stability 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 / fin. stability, see Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries – Specific Part, Chapter 5.2.1.	(a) The criterion is met if the applicant has demonstrated fin. stability / turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the applicant has failed to demonstrate fin. stability / turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call.
F13	x	The number of applications for support is equivalent to the number set by the call.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support	An assessment is made whether the applicant has respected the max. number of applications per applicant in the call. The max. number of applications for support in the call which can be submitted by one applicant is set by the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the number of applications for support submitted by the applicant is in accordance with the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the number of applications for support submitted by the applicant is not in accordance with the call.

Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Pre-Application Research" – eligibility check

criterion code	Project quality aspect	criterion name	position	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method (yes/no, irrelevant)	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criterion description	main source of information	criterion 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 for 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	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	(a) The criterion is met if the project impact is exclusively 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 impact is not exclusively
P6	feasibility/effectiveness	Project activities are unique for applicants/partners	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: – Project description – Key activities annexes to the application for support: (MS2014+, database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI)	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. 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.	(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. (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.
P7	feasibility	Involvement of a partner has been demonstrated in accordance with the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: annexes to application for support: – Principles of partnership / Partnership agreement	An assessment is made whether the conditions for the involvement of a partners are in accordance with the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the involvement of the partner meets the conditions of the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the partnership is not set in accordance with the conditions of the call.
P8	efficiency	The project is in line with State aid rules.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	An assessment is made: (a) whether the call allows support 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. The check is based on the applicant's declaration (annex to application for support), 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. The verification is recorded in a checklist. Different options depending on the scheme: - support 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 support in accordance with Regulation No 1407/2013 - services of general economic interest pursuant to Decision 2012/21/EU - support in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014	(a) the criterion is met if the project does not cumulatively constitute State aid. (b) the criterion is not met if the project constitutes State aid.

Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Pre-Application Research" – expert evaluation - step 1												
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**
V1.1	feasibility	**Overlap of applications for 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.

next criterion name	criterion code	Project quality aspect	criterion name	function - criteria	evaluation method (yes/no, not relevant - criterion)	evaluation method (yes/no, not relevant - criterion)	evaluation score to be used for additional criterion	minimum score to pass evaluation for additional criterion	Evaluation of WEAKest	brief criterion description	main source of information	criterion description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
Applicant's/partner	VEA	Feasibility	**The structure and size of the expert team (FTEs, including possible outsourcing)**	exploration	no	1	-	4	external contractor	An assessment is made of the structure and size of the administration team/ FTEs, including any outsourcing, with regard to the structure and scope of activities and project size.	Application for support - Deliverables Annexes to the application for support - Time/Utility ready	An assessment is made of the structure and size of the administrative team/ under the criterion 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 VC1 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 Yes: 0 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. 1 point: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. No: 2 points: Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant does not have sufficient administrative team for the implementation of the project.
	VEA	Feasibility	**The structure and size of the expert team (FTEs, including possible outsourcing)**	conditional		no	-	4		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 structure 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 (evaluated under criterion VC1 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.	Application for support - Deliverables Annexes to the application for support - CV of the expert team members - Time/Utility ready Opinion of an external expert	The applicant describes the structure and size of the expert team under the criterion Yes: 0 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. 1 point: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. No: 2 points: Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant does not have sufficient administrative team for the implementation of the project. The evaluator does not evaluate the rates (evaluated under criterion VC1), but only the size and structure of the expert team.
	VEA	Feasibility/Effectiveness	**Quality of nominated members of the expert team**	conditional		no	-	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. Annexes to the feasibility study may be used to assess the quality of the research team and the relevance of their current research work to the research activities of the project.	Application for support - Deliverables Annexes to the application for support - CV of the expert team members - Time/Utility ready Opinion of an external expert	The applicant has described the criterion in the application for support as follows: Yes: 0 points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The key researchers have the required type of knowledge in the international, or, as evidenced by their history 1 point: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The key researchers have the required type of knowledge in the international context, but their history is not sufficiently diversified. Expected benefits of the project are described in general terms. No: 2 points: Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant does not have sufficient knowledge and experience in the field of the project. The quality of the key researchers is not on good and there is a risk that they will not be able to implement activities as planned and meet their commitments.
Project description	VEA	Viability	**Project necessity**	conditional	yes	no	-	4		The criterion aims to justify the project proposal and to show the need of their enforcement given the particular state of knowledge in the given area/field and the expected benefits, results and outcome of the project.	Application for support - project description Annexes to the application for support - Time/Utility ready - Opinion of an external expert on overview of the key outputs to achieve the SMART indicators Opinion of an external expert	The criterion aims to justify the project objectives and show the need of their enforcement given the particular state of knowledge in the given area/field and the expected benefits, results and outcome of the project. The applicant has described the relevance of the project. Yes: 0 points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The applicant has adequately and clearly described the problem / the justification of the objective and the necessity of the project. The justification is sufficiently and specifically supported with the project plan. Reasons / methods in the project plans clearly and adequately justify the necessity of the project. 1 point: Good 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 substantively only partially and/or not specifically corresponds with the project plan. The reasoning for the project implementation is justified as general text. No: 2 points: Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant has not sufficiently justified the project implementation, justification is not substantively and/or not specifically corresponds with the project plan.
	VEA	Adequacy/Efficiency	**The impact, main contributions, and purpose of the project**	conditional		no	-	4		An assessment is made of whether the method is/are the problem (defined on the basis of the analysis, e.g. on VC2) and the significance and contribution of the project (defined based on research) will represent a noticeable contribution in the objectives defined under the call (i.e. support for the intensification of long-term mixed-cycle/cooperation between sectors, or support for the establishment and development of partnerships between HEIs and the application sector). Expected benefit of the project should correspond with research centers identified and described by the applicant. An assessment is made of whether an started progress in the relevant issue and the corresponding objectives have been defined. In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	Application for support - project description Annexes to the application for support - Time/Utility ready - Opinion of an overview of the key outputs to achieve the SMART indicators Opinion of an external expert	The applicant describes the impact, main benefits and purpose of the project under the criterion Yes: 0 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 conclusive and sufficiently described. Expected benefits of the project are described sufficiently described. Expected benefits of the project are described specifically. 1 point: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The expected benefits are described in general terms. The justification is substantively only partially and/or not partially corresponds with the project plan. Proposals / methods in the project plans clearly and adequately justify the project benefits. Although the necessity of the project is justified in general terms, it corresponds with the current situation in the field. No: 2 points: Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The applicant has not sufficiently justified the project benefits, contribution is not substantively and/or not specifically corresponds with the project plan.
	VEA	Sufficiency	**Substantive content and relevance of activities**	conditional		no	-	4		Assessing 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. 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 planned indicator of the future project implementation, the achievement of indicators and goals of the project, including its benefits and overall meaningfulness. In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	Application for support - Deliverables/Activities - Time/Utility ready Annexes to the application for support - Time/Utility ready Opinion of an external expert	Disputes – Activities are clearly and specifically described, their relation to budget items can be evaluated and related outcomes can be formulated. Yes: 0 points – Activities correspond to the project objectives, but the applicant has partial objectives (relation to budget items, outputs, etc). 1 point – the evaluator has strong objections (relation to budget items, outputs, etc.). No: 2points – Activities are not transparent, described insufficiently and in unsystematic terms, the relation between the activities and the budget cannot be identified / a insufficient Proposed activities threaten the feasibility of the project.
	VEA	Feasibility	**Schedule and logical consistency of project activities**	conditional		1	-	2		Assessing whether the proposed schedule of activities is logically and realistically set.	Application for support - Deliverables/Activities - Activities workloads Annexes to the application for support - schedule of key activities - Time/Utility ready 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 the applicant has sufficient capacities in-house). The schedule of activities is 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: Yes: 0points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The schedule of activities is logically coherent and time-allocated to each key activity is adequate. 1 point: Good 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. No: 2points – Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The proposed schedule does not have sufficient logical coherence and time allocation for activities, potentially failing of the schedule is illogical and threatens the feasibility of the project.
	VEA	Feasibility	**Risk management – readiness for possible risks and their evolution**	conditional		1	-	2		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 - Time/Utility ready	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. It is also necessary for the project to contain methods of risk prevention and proposals of measures to eliminate such risk. The purpose of the criterion is to assess to what extent the applicant realizes 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: Yes: 0points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The risks are complete. 1 point: Good 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. No: 2points – Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. No significant risks are defined.
	VEA	Effectiveness/Long-term impact	**Research results applicability potential**	conditional		10	-	4		An assessment is made of the possible future application of research results in practice.	Application for support - Deliverables Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready Opinion of an external expert	An assessment is made of the possible future application of research results in practice i.e. how realistic it is for the research results to be subsequently transferred into practice by applied research. This is also related to whether a project team has experience with such outputs, whether the service has been in contact with the application of research results into practice or cooperates with the application sector. In assessing this criterion, the evaluator must take into account the opinion of the external expert.	The applicant has described the area related to the application of research results: Yes: 0points – Excellent or very well, the shortcomings, if any, are insignificant. Application of results in practice is described, the potential to ensure the application of results in practice. 1 point: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. Application of results in practice is uncertain. No: 2points – Weak or irrelevant / not at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or the evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The potential to use the results
	VEA	Viability	**Quality of research objectives**	conditional		25	-	10		An assessment is made of the quality of the submitted research plans and their activities an international scale, i.e. the extent to which the proposed research plans have scientific potential to achieve results equivalent to those of research teams in the relevant field. 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.	Application for support - Deliverables Annexes to the application for support - Time/Utility ready Opinion of an external expert	The quality of the submitted research plans and their activities has been described: Yes: 0points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The / is a good research plan comparable to international / context. 1 point: Good 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. 2 No: 0 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 quality of the research plans and their activities is not sufficient, the outputs are below the expected level.
Results and outputs	VEA	Sufficiency	**Suitability, specification, appropriateness and feasibility of chosen result and output indicators**	conditional	yes	no	-	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. 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 annexes the application for support.	Application for support - indicators Annexes to application for support - Overview of the key outputs to contribute to the indicators - Time/Utility ready	Consideration is given to whether or not the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen. Yes: 0points: 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 corresponds to the selected activities and leads to the achievement of results/outputs. The value of the proposed indicators in proportionate to the proposed activities and the probability of achieving them is high. 1 point: Good 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 in 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. No: 2points – Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal 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, the plan is ambiguously, unrealistically and unsystematically set.
Funding of the project	VEA	Effectiveness/cost-balance/economy	**Adequacy and consistency of the budget with respect to the project content and scope**	conditional	yes	no	-	4		An assessment is made of whether the size of the budget and the individual budget items are duly justified with regard to the project content and scope, the extent of the activities, and the planned results/outputs, i.e. an assessment is made of the appropriateness of the project budget, i.e. reasoning for it/ rate (evaluated under criterion effectiveness), An assessment is made of the clarity of the budget.	**(a)** an assessment is made of the **justification of the budget size and individual budget items** given the duration of the project, content of activities, planned results/outputs in relation to the research part of the project, the applicant's organizational structure, and the scope of the project team. The evaluator states its objections and reduces the score if the budget is overvalued or undervalued in relation to the above criteria. - **Appropriateness of the personnel costs** with respect to the **project team** with respect to the quality/performing 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 the **procurement, services, works** and goods for the project, whether they are not redundant for the project **implementation**, and whether the purchase of the procured goods and services are not disproportionate. - **Appropriateness of the leased premises** given the needs of the project. - appropriateness **of the quantity and parameters of the procured IT equipment. - Proportionality of the budget items** for the **travel costs** (e.g. proportionality of purchasing the equipment for the project team and FTE of project team members). - Whether the particular items correspond to prices typical at the place and time. - Rates for applicants and beneficiaries, or in the call. The appropriateness and technical correctness need to be assessed both for the project budget items, as 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. The evaluator does not evaluate the **budget clarity** – 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 requesting unchanged items, but down in the call / follow-up documentation.	Dispatch: The budget is reasonable, parameters of procured supplies, services and works are sufficiently justified in the project plans and the budget items are duly justified with regard to the project content and scope, the extent of the activities, and the planned results/outputs, i.e. the budget items are duly justified with regard to the project content and scope, the extent of the activities, and the planned results/outputs, i.e. an assessment is made of the appropriateness of the project budget, i.e. reasoning for it/ rate (evaluated under criterion effectiveness), An assessment is made of the clarity of the budget. Yes: 0 points: The budget is adequately overvalued or undervalued, there is a larger number of items that are not justified, a significant reduction is proposed (voluntarily) 20-40% of the total budget). 1 point: The budget is significantly overvalued or undervalued, the relevance of the budget with the activities is not convincing / cannot be unambiguously identified. 2points: The budget is totally inadequate, poorly designed and unrealistic. The budget is totally inadequate.
	VEA	Efficiency	**General conditions of the expenses eligibility**	exploration		no	-	4		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 impossible 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.	Application for support - Budget - Deliverables/Activities - project description Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready	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. Yes: 0points: The budget is fully in line with the eligibility rules. 1 No: 2points: The budget contains ineligible costs, which can be eliminated from the budget based on evaluator's objection. No: 0points – The budget contains ineligible costs, which cannot be eliminated from the budget while maintaining project feasibility. Note, the evaluator should focus on assessing the general eligibility of expenditure under the rules of OP RDE (subcentive coherence hierarchy) and the specific rules of the call (e.g. whether the acquisition of a car is eligible, whether the acquisition of this equipment is not redundant, i.e. subject to evaluation criterion VC.5).
	VEA	economy	**Focusing on financing during the implementation phase**	exploration		1	-	4		Assessment is made whether the applicant is able to meet the co-financing commitment.	Application for support - overview of funding sources Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready	Assessment is made whether the applicant is able to meet the co-financing commitment.	Subtitle: The applicant is able to demonstrate how co-financing of the project will be arranged. The method of co-financing is clear and realistic. 1 Opposite: The applicant is not able to demonstrate how co-financing of the project will be arranged. The method of co-financing is unclear/vague/unrealistic. If the applicant has 0% co-financing, the project is given full scores.
Horizontal themes	VEA	Adequacy/Lack of infringement with horizontal principles	**Compliance of the project with horizontal principles**	milieu/economy	yes/no	no	-	4		An assessment is made of whether the project supports/does not support/does not affect any of the horizontal principles.	Application for support - Horizontal principles	An assessment is made of whether equal opportunities are ensured, regardless of the type of disability, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, age or sexual orientation, regardless of the marriage, etc. Specifically, it is examined how the proposed solutions fulfil equal opportunities. An assessment is made of whether or not the project discriminates against certain groups. An assessment is made of the project's relationship to sustainable development, especially to environmental aspects (e.g. whether the project supports/does not support/does not affect any environmental impacts (minimizing noise emissions, air pollutant emissions, contamination of the surroundings etc.), or on the territory, impacts of the project on improving the environment). An assessment is made of whether or not the project contributes to the fulfilment of the requirements albeit sustainable development (especially about environmental issues), to reasonable use of natural resources (where appropriate) and the project's contribution to strengthening the social and economic pillars of sustainability.	yes – The project is in line with the horizontal principle. The project is specifically aimed / has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal theme. no – The project is not in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal theme.
Compliance with strategies	VEA	efficiency	**Compliance with RIS3**	exploration/efficiency	n	yes/no	-	4		An assessment is made of whether the project's activities/section are in accordance with the RIS3 strategy according to the territorial (ex-ante) and whether the project contributes to their achievement.	Application for support Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready - Opinion of an expert on the RIS3 strategy	An assessment is made of whether the project's activities/section are in accordance with the RIS3 strategy according to the territorial (ex-ante) and whether the project contributes to their achievement.	It is assessed whether the focus of research programmes and activities is in accordance with at least one general knowledge domain and also at least one key application sector and application theme specified in the National RIS3 Strategy or its regional annex. YES – if it is in accordance NO – if is not in accordance
Synergies	VEA	effectiveness	**Synergy potential**	exploration	n	no	-	4		An assessment is made of the synergistic potential of the project.	Application for support Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready	An assessment is made of the synergistic potential of the project and the feasibility of the described synergies in the project. Information on synergies is to be provided by the applicant in the form of a description in the project submission annex. Information on the project's synergies with other projects is also subject of the project, the application of the results in the application sector. Follow-up activity / synergistic potential will be described by the applicant in the application for support under the sub "synergies", or in the free/activity study.	Opposite – the project has synergistic potential. Opposite – the project does not have synergistic potential.
Economic activity	VEA	economy	**Sustainability**	conditional		no	-	4		An assessment is made of the setting and ensuring sustainability under the terms of the call / follow-up documentation.	Application for support Annexes to application for support - Time/Utility ready	An assessment is made of whether the project has sufficiently detailed plan of costs and revenues, which is based on credible and clearly formulated assumptions, and is designed so that it can be reasonably assumed that financial sustainability of the project will be ensured at least for the sustainability/expected specified by the call. The project has an adequate plan of measures that will contribute to the substantive sustainability of project activities and outputs.	The evaluator assesses the setting and ensuring sustainability under the terms of the call / follow-up documentation. The applicant has described the area: Yes: 0points: Excellent or very well, any shortcomings or possible improvements are partial. The project has a detailed plan of costs and revenues, an adequate plan of measures that will contribute to the substantive sustainability of activities and outputs. Financial sustainability of the project will be ensured. 1 No: 2points: Good or sufficient, improvements will be needed or there are significant shortcomings. The project has a plan of work and revenues, has a plan of measures that will contribute to the substantive sustainability of activities and outputs, and a plan for human resource development, however, all of these show shortcomings. Although the financial sustainability of the project is ensured, there is a risk that after the financial sustainability of the project and human resource development of the institution. No: 2points – Weak or irrelevant / none at all, there are serious unresolvable shortcomings, or the proposal does not address the aspects evaluated in the criterion, or its evaluation is impossible due to absence of or insufficient information. The project does not have a sufficiently detailed plan of costs and revenues, which is based on credible and clearly formulated assumptions. The project does not have a plan of action that would contribute to the sustainability of project activities and outputs. Financial sustainability of the project is not ensured.
Number of criteria in the evaluation sheet													
Maximum score - only feasibility													
Other criteria, which are to be the subject of the consultation													
Min. score of overall evaluation to be evaluation for arbitrator involvement													