



### Annex No. 2 Evaluation criteria - Formal check

| sequence | criteria name  | criteria description   | function  | correctable/uncorrectable | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | main source of information                    | evaluator                  | instructions for evaluators   |
|----------|--|--|-----------|---------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| F1       | <b>The grant application was submitted in the prescribed form</b>                                | It is evaluated, whether the application was finalized in electronic form in the MS2014+ application. Inspected at the stage of finalization of the grant application automatically, no need to check by the evaluator.  | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | grant application                             | MS2014+                    | MS2014+ - control at the application phase automatically, other than electronically submitted are not possible  |
| F2       | <b>In the grant application all required data is filled out</b>                                  | Inspected at the stage of finalization of the grant application automatically, no need to check by the evaluator.  | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application                             | MS2014+                    | MS2014+ - check automatically   |
| F3       | <b>All required annexes are documented and in the required form</b>                              | a) It is evaluated, whether all relevant mandatory annexes have been delivered, which were specified in the call.<br>b) It is evaluated, whether all annexes are documented in the form specified by the call.   | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application annexes                     | internal evaluator/MS2014+ | a) MS2014+ - Automatically checks for mandatory annexes - mandatory fields<br>b) Evaluator - evaluation of the annex form, i.e. according to the call specification (format, attachment template/specimen, etc.).   |
| F4       | <b>The grant application was submitted in the language determined in the call</b>                | a) It is evaluated, whether the request incl. all required and optional annexes was made in the language determined by the challenge, i.e. in Czech.<br>b) It is evaluated, whether the request incl. all required and optional annexes was submitted in the English language, as a separate compulsory attachment of the grant application.   | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application, annexes                    | evaluator/MS2014+          |   |
| F5       | <b>Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register</b> | 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 accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered/listed.<br>a) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the applicant is included in the grant application.<br>b) It is evaluated, whether the applicant's identification data is in accordance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).   | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application: - Project subjects annexes | evaluator/MS2014+          | a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields<br>b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register<br>c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible with MS2014+             |
| F6       | <b>Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register</b>   | 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 accordance with the extract/extracts from the register in which the partner is registered/listed.<br>a) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the partner/partners is included in the grant application.<br>b) It is evaluated, whether the partner's/partners' identification data is in accordance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.). | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application: - Project subjects annexes | evaluator/MS2014+          | a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields<br>b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register<br>c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible to evaluate with MS2014+ |



| Annex No. 2 Evaluation criteria - Formal check |  |  |           |                           |  |  |                                |   |
|--|--|--|-----------|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| sequence                                       | criteria name  | criteria description   | function  | correctable/uncorrectable | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | main source of information                                   | evaluator                      | instructions for evaluators   |
| F7   | <b>The grant application is signed by the applicant's/partner's legal representative</b>                       | <p>All documents containing the signature box and the name/identification characteristics of the applicant entity have an electronic signature of the statutory body or representative/representatives of the statutory body.</p> <p>Documents can also be signed (documents must not be older than 90 calendar days from the date of grant application submission in IS KP14+):</p> <p>By another person authorized by power of attorney to the submitted 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 in scanned form 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 the formalities of power of attorney.</p> <p>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 scanned form as 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> | exclusion | correctable               | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Signature of the application annexes | internal evaluator/<br>MS2014+ | <p>a) cannot be finalized without a signature, automatically checked by MS2014+</p> <p>b) the signature relevance is checked by the evaluator (the signature may not agree with the approved/entrusted/authorized person)</p> <p><b>Formalities of the power of attorney:</b></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   | <b>Estimated time of project implementation in accordance with the call terms</b>                              | It is evaluated, whether the duration of the project implementation (number of months) and the period of project implementation (from-to) correspond to the call terms.  | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Project annexes                      | internal evaluator/<br>MS2014+ | <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   | <b>The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of total eligible expenditure determined in the call</b> | It is evaluated, whether the amount of the total eligible expenditure correspond to the conditions of the call.  | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Budget                               | MS2014+                        | <p>a) This criterion is met if the required grant amount is in the stated range of the minimum and maximum grant amount for the particular call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met in the case that the required grant amount is not within the specified range of the minimum and maximum grant amount in the context of the call, i.e. requested funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.</p>   |



| Annex No. 2 Evaluation criteria - Formal check |   |   |           |                           |  |  |                       |  |  |
|--|---|---|-----------|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|
| sequence                                       | criteria name   | criteria description  | function  | correctable/uncorrectable | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | main source of information                         | evaluator             | instructions for evaluators  |  |
| F10  | The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call                                     | It is evaluated, whether the request respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call and the Rules for applicants and recipients.   | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Budget                     | MS2014+               | If the MS2014+ will not automatically control limits, the criterion will be assessed at the stage of objective evaluation. |  |
| F11  | The amount of the applicant's own resources in the financing overview is being provided in accordance with the call | It is evaluated, whether in the grant application the applicant's own resources are included, in accordance with the Rules for applicants and recipients and the wording of the call.   | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Financing sources overview | evaluator/<br>MS2014+ |  |  |
| F12  | The financial health of the applicant   | <p>It is evaluated, whether the annual turnover of the applicant entity is min. one half of the eligible expenditure stated in the grant application With projects lasting 12 months or less, whether it reaches this entire amount. In the case of projects where a financial partner/partners participates/participate on the implementation, the relevant part corresponding to the partner/partners share can be demonstrated by the applicant through a partner/partners. The condition of achieving the required turnover is met for two closed accounting period of 12 months, (if existent) and for which the applicant had to submit a tax return, and which predate the submission date of the application. This fact is demonstrated by the applicant by submitting the Profit and loss statement for the period specified above.</p> <p>The definition of annual turnover is specified in § 20 para. 1 point. A) section 2 of the Accounting Act no. 563/1991 Coll.: "... the annual total net turnover is, for the purposes of this Act, the amount of revenue reduced by sales discounts and divided by the number of commenced months, for which the accounting period lasted, multiplied by twelve..."</p> <p>Taxpayers who have not been formed or established for the purpose of business (§ 18 par. 3 of the Income Tax Act No. 586/1992 Coll. ), indicate the annual net turnover of the overall activity, i.e. the main and economic activities.</p> <p>Taxpayers who keep tax records, state the total of all revenues achieved in the taxable period or the period for which they submitted the last tax return for income tax.</p> <p><b>For applicants listed in annex no. 1 and 2 of the Act no. 111/1998 Coll., on universities, as amended:</b></p> <p>Applicants do not report turnover. The financial stability of applicants is evaluated through annual or other economic reports of the applicant.</p> | exclusion | uncorrectable             | yes/no                                     | annexes:   | evaluator             |  |  |



### Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Eligibility check

| sequence | quality aspect of the project | criterion name  | function  | correctable/uncorrectable | criteria description  | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | the main source of information (specific grant application tab)  | evaluator                      | instructions for evaluators  |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|-----------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| P1       | expediency                    | <b>The grant application is in its focus in line with the objectives and activities of the call</b> | exclusion | uncorrectable             | It is evaluated, whether the project objectives and activities correspond to the given call requirements.<br><br>It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted all the required activities according to the text of the call.  | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Activities<br>- Key activities<br>- Specific objectives<br>- Project description annexes | internal evaluator             | 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.<br><br>b) The criterion is not met if it is inconsistent with the objectives and/or activities of the call or the way of implementation of activities is contrary to the conditions for the implementation of the project mentioned in the call.  |
| P2       | expediency                    | <b>Target groups are in accordance with the call</b>  | exclusion | uncorrectable             | It is evaluated, whether the target groups are in line with the legitimate target groups in the call.   | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Target groups<br>Key activities annexes  | internal evaluator             | a) This criterion is met if the target groups correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call.<br><br>b) This criterion is not met if the target groups do not correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call.  |
| P3       | feasibility                   | <b>The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call</b>              | exclusion | uncorrectable             | Within this criteria it is evaluated, whether the applicant entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call and related documentation, in accordance with Act no. 218/2000 Coll. On budgetary rules.<br>It is evaluated, whether the applicant meets:<br>The eligible applicant type according to the call<br><br>It is evaluated, whether the applicant meets the following conditions, through an affidavit in the grant application annex.<br>the applicant is not in bankruptcy pursuant to Act no. 182/2006 Coll., on Bankruptcy and Its Resolution (Insolvency Act), as amended; no execution or enforcement of the judgement is filed against the applicant and he is not in liquidation;<br>has no unpaid taxes in the tax evidence both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence;<br>Has no arrears on premiums and penalties for public health insurance or social security contributions and the state employment policy, both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence; has clean criminal record.<br>With regard to the principle of transparency and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, applicants will be required to the extent appropriate, to publish/prove their ownership structure. Applicants who do not publish/do not prove ownership structure (or applicants, where there is a conflict of interests) are not legitimate applicants. It is evaluated, whether the applicant documents the ownership structure in accordance with Act no. 218/2000 Coll., i.e. if the applicant is a legal entity, whether the identification information on persons acting on its behalf was documented, stating whether they are acting as its statutory authority or are acting under a power of attorney, persons with a share in this legal person, persons, in which the applicant has a share, and about that share amount. | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Project subjects annexes   | internal evaluator/<br>MS2014+ | 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 OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.<br><br>b) This criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) or does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.<br><br>MS2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the applicant.<br><br>The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and recipients are met as defined in the call. |



**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Eligibility check**

| sequence | quality aspect of the project | criterion name   | function  | correctable/ uncorrectable | criteria description  | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | the main source of information (specific grant application tab)  | evaluator                      | instructions for evaluators  |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| P4       |                               | <b>The project partner meets the conditions of eligibility of a partner</b>                    |           |                            | <p>It is evaluated, whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set out in the call, related documentation to the call, Rules for applicants and recipients.</p> <p>It is evaluated, whether the partner meets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorized partner type</li> </ul> <p>It is evaluated, whether the partner meets the following conditions, through an affidavit in the <b>grant application annex</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partner is not in bankruptcy pursuant to Act no. 182/2006 Coll., on Bankruptcy and Its Resolution (Insolvency Act), as amended; no execution or enforcement of the judgment is filed against the applicant and he is not in liquidation;</li> <li>• has no unpaid taxes in the tax evidence both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence;</li> <li>• Has no arrears on premiums and penalties for public health insurance or social security contributions and the state employment policy, both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence;</li> <li>• is criminally blameless.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• With regard to the principle of transparency and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, partners will be required to the extent appropriate, to publish/prove their ownership structure. Partners who do not publish/do not prove ownership structure or partners, where there is a conflict of interests are not legitimate partners.</li> <li>• It is evaluated, whether the partner documents the ownership structure in accordance with Act no. 218/2000 Coll., i.e. if the partner is a legal entity, whether the identification information was documented <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. persons acting on its behalf was documented, stating whether they are acting as its statutory authority or are acting under a power of attorney,</li> <li>2. persons with a share in this legal person,</li> <li>3. persons, in which the applicant has a share, and about that share amount.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Project annex<br><br>subjects  | internal evaluator/<br>MS2014+ | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>S2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the partner.</p> <p>The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and recipients are met as defined in the call.</p> |
| P5       | feasibility                   | <b>Implementation and impact place of the project in accordance with the terms of the call</b> | exclusion | uncorrectable              | 4. It is evaluated, whether the place of implementation and place of impact of the project in accordance with the terms   | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- Location<br>- Activities<br>- Key activities<br>- Project description<br>annexes | internal evaluator/<br>MS2014+ | <p>The applicant selects the place of implementation and place of impact from a preset dial in relation to specific activities. The evaluator checks the entire application in relation to specific activities:</p> <p>a) This criterion is met if the project has an impact only on the territory, resp. target group according to the call.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the project has not an impact only on the territory, resp. target group according to the call.</p>  |
| P6       | feasibility                   | <b>Documented involvement of the partner in</b>  | exclusion | uncorrectable              | <i>In relevant cases, i.e. when involving a partner:</i> It is evaluated, whether the conditions for the involvement of the partner is in accordance with the call.   | yes/no                                     | grant application, annexes   | evaluator                      |  |
| P7       | feasibility                   | <b>Collaborating entity</b>  | exclusion | uncorrectable              | It is evaluated, whether in the grant application is given at least one foreign strategic cooperative entity with which international cooperation will be developed   | yes/no                                     | grant application:<br>- key activity<br>Development of strategic partnerships                            | evaluator                      |  |





**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Eligibility check**

| sequence | quality aspect of the project | criterion name   | function  | correctable/uncorrectable | criteria description  | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount | the main source of information (specific grant application tab)   | evaluator | instructions for evaluators  |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------|---------------------------|---|--|---|-----------|--|
| P8       | feasibility                   | <b>Key foreign researcher</b>                                | exclusion | uncorrectable             | It is evaluated, whether a key foreign researcher is involved in the project, who will have a minimum annual working time of at least 0,5 FTE fully implemented in the applicant's R&D centre for the time of project implementation, with the onset of the project at the latest before signing the act, and within 5 years (2009-2013) did not exceed the annual amount of the worker's employment in the applicant's or partner's institution 0.2 FTE. The applicant's obligations with respect to the sustainability of the project are defined in the text of the call.  | yes/no                                     | grant application: - project management activity<br>annex:<br>- employment contract/certificate of max. 0,2 employment full-time equivalent | evaluator |  |
| P9       | feasibility                   | <b>Research team</b>   | exclusion | uncorrectable             | It is evaluated, whether the project proposal mentions at least 1/3 of scientists by name - members of the new research team, incl. key foreign research personnel (hereinafter KZVP).  | yes/no                                     | grant application: project management activity<br>- Implementation team,<br>annexes:<br>- CV of researchers                                 | evaluator |  |
| P10      | feasibility/effectiveness     | <b>Project activities are unique for applicants/partners</b> | exclusion | uncorrectable             | It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another OP RDE project. There must be always substantively different or follow-up outcomes. Evaluation takes place via the MS2014+ or OP RDE outputs database.<br><br>It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another Operating programme OPC project. There must be always substantively different or follow-up activities/outcomes. Evaluation takes place through a database of OPC/OP RDI outputs.<br><br>The applicant demonstrates an affidavit that no public funding is being/was received for project activities. It is evaluated on the basis of the analysis, which is part of the Charter:<br>It is evaluated in what quality the applicant performed an analysis/survey of already created products, methodologies, materials related to the focus of the project prior to grant application.<br>It is evaluated, whether part of the analysis is the expression, how the already developed products will be used in the project implementation. | yes/no                                     | - grant application:<br>- Project description<br>- Activities<br>- Key activities<br><br>(MS2014+ database outputs of OP RDE/OPC/OP RDI)    | evaluator | The applicant demonstrates an affidavit that no public funding is being/was received for project activities. |

**R&D Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name   | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name  | sub-criteria evaluation description   | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information  | evaluator                     | instructions for evaluators/leading questions  | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |
|---|---|----------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| applicant/partner   | feasibility                                   | V1.1                 | <b>R&amp;D centre</b>   | Is the applicant's R&D centre a thematically clearly profiled research and development centre, which is active in research activities and the programme combines research, development and education?   | yes/no   | x                        | grant application:<br>- Project description<br>- Key activities<br><br>annex:<br>- Feasibility study                                  | external evaluator/arbitrator | Are the main activities of the R&D centre activities in the field of R&D? Does the R&D centre realizes its research and development activities continuously for the past 7 years (2009-2015)? Does the preparation of future graduates of master's or doctoral programme belong to the activities of the R&D centre? Is the R&D centre clearly profiled as a place, which centralizes research goals, with clearly defined content and research goals?   | exclusion               | exclusion              | x   | x  | x  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V1.2                 | <b>Active independent research of the key foreign researcher (KFR)</b>  | Is a key foreign researcher (KFR) involved in the project, which worked in foreign R&D institution in the years 2009-2013, where he was responsible for active independent research, at least for 36 consecutive calendar months?   | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annex:<br>- CV KFR,<br>- Description of research activities<br>- Feasibility study |                               | Is just one KFR specifically listed in the project application as a head of the research team, who has within the last 5 years (years 2009-2013) worked in a foreign R&D institution?<br><br>Did the KFR carry out independent research for at least 36 consecutive calendar months during his work in the foreign R&D institutions? As implementation of active independent research is considered to lead an independent research team or the role of a principal investigator of the research project, while actively publishing research results in scientific journals.   |                         | exclusion              | x   | x  |  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V1.3                 | <b>KFR scientific classification</b>  | Does the KFR involved in the project meet the characteristics of scientific classification Establish Researcher (R3) or higher?<br><i>(http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/Towards_a_European_Framework_for_Research_Careers_final.pdf)</i>                              | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annex:<br>- CV KFR,<br>- Feasibility study - Description of research activities    |                               | Does the KFR fulfill all the necessary competences for granting classification Established Researcher (R3)?  |                         | exclusion              | x   | x  |  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V1.4                 | <b>Recruitment of researchers</b>   | Does the project application include a plan to recruit researchers to the research team, that assumes full implementation of recruitment before the end of the project?   | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Key activities<br><br>annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |                               | Is the schedule recruitment of researchers to the research team stated in the project application, including not nominated positions? Does the project application include a time schedule to recruit researchers to the research team, that assumes occupying all the positions before the end of the project?  |                         | exclusion              | x   | x  |  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V1.5                 | <b>KZVP organizational integration</b>  | Does the project application include a plan for the organizational integration of a key foreign researcher and the research team into the structure of the applicant's R&D centre that assumes transparency in management of human resources and management of the team R&D activities? | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Key activities<br><br>annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |                               | Is there a plan of organization KFR and scientific team into the structure of the applicant's R&D centre stated in the project application which specifies a clear interconnection with the organizational structure of the R&D centre? Are in the project application clearly described key processes and liabilities of individuals for recruitment, evaluation and remuneration of scientific personnel and management and coordination of R&D activities of the team?  |                         | exclusion              | x   | x  |  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V1.6                 | <b>Technically competent infrastructural base</b>   | Is there evidence that the applicant will have the latest from 1. 1. 2016 a technically capable infrastructural base, where the project will be implemented?  | yes/no   |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |                               | Is there an Occupancy Permit to use the construction (building) documented in the project application issued no later than the date of termination of the call or Trial operation Permit, which is carried out under conditions non limiting routine use of the building, issued no later than the date of termination of the call or the Building handover Protocol, issued no later than the date completion of the call, which includes proof of comprehensive testing of all internal building systems, or, assuming that none of the previously mentioned documents was issued, the Time schedule for the construction of a milestone, Final work handover scheduled for no later than the first 1. 1. 2016? Is there an Affidavit of the applicant and/or partner documented in the project application declaring that all existing instrumentation necessary for the implementation of the research agenda, is owned by the applicant or the partner, or will be owned by the applicant or partner at least before the 1. 1. 2016 and fully operational for the purpose of research agenda implementation?<br><br>As an infrastructural base is considered a laboratory, technical and office space, along with instrumentation and material and technical equipment necessary for the implementation of the research agenda of the project fully covering its needs, except for equipment that is sourced separately for the project's purposes. As a technically capable infrastructural base is considered such an infrastructure platform that is fully functional for the purpose of research agenda implementation. |                         | exclusion              | x   | x  |  |
| applicant's R&D centre environment preparedness for the project | feasibility                                   | V2.1                 | The quality of the previous research activities of the R&D centre of the applicant in comparison with relevant institutions abroad. |   | 5  | 30                       | annex:<br>- Feasibility study, the top 10 results of the R&D centre, 10 top R&D centre researchers                                    |                               | To what extent are the content, scope and nature of research activities in the centre comparable with relevant institutions in the field abroad? Taking into account the results of the R&D centre, consider the extent to which these results are comparable with the results of relevant institutions with similar aims abroad.  | combined                | evaluating             | 14  | x  | 23   |

**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name   | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name  | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion  | main source of information  | evaluator  | instructions for evaluators/leading questions  | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |   |
|---|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|---|
|   | feasibility                                   | V2.2                 | The quality of the organizational and management structure of the applicant's R&D centre, the way of human resource management and financial management                       |                                     | 10   | 30  | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |  | To what extent is the organizational and management structure of the centre proper and effective in comparison with good international practice applied by the relevant institutions in the field abroad?<br>Evaluate the scope of the competences in the sub-levels of decision-making, in particular whether the leading research teams have a sufficient degree of independence in making personnel decisions within the research team, including remuneration.<br>To what extent is the method of evaluating activities and outcomes of research teams comparable to good international practice? Consider the degree of evaluation independence of activities and results of the research teams, and the fact that if the evaluation is conducted in the form of an independent peer-review in the centre.<br>An independent evaluation can be considered as such, which is carried out by a team of scientists who are not in a conflict of interest with any of the scientific researchers (no common publications, no common grants, etc.), and whose scientific level is correspondingly high in terms of the evaluated team quality. | combined                | evaluating             | 6   |  |  |   |
|   | feasibility                                   | V2.3                 | The quality of infrastructure and material and technical equipment of the applicant's R&D centre  |                                     | 5  |   | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |  | To what extent does the research infrastructure of the R&D centre, key instrumentation and material-technical provision correspond to the level of relevant institutions of similar orientation abroad? Consider the range and technical sophistication of the R&D centre equipment for implementation of its research activities.   |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |
|   | feasibility                                   | V2.4                 | The quality of the current activities of international cooperation of the applicant's R&D centre  |                                     | 5  |   | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- 5 most important achievements in international cooperation |  | To what extent do the activities and successes of such activities of international cooperation of the R&D 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 key foreign partners. To what extent does the R&D centre make use of international co-operation projects' potential for its own development?  |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |
|   | economy                                       | V2.5                 | Experience with the implementation of research projects of a similar financial scope  |                                     | 5  |   | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Realized R&D investment projects                           |  | Consider the range of experience of the applicant and/or partner with the implementation of research projects of a similar financial scale. Consider the extent to which these projects comparable in the amount and ratio of investment and non-investment part of the budget with the project presented in the grant application.  |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |
| Applicant's plan to develop the relevant R&D centre by means of the project | expediency                                    | V3.1                 | The ambitiousness (and simultaneously feasibility) of the R&D centre development plan of the applicant in the areas of R&D relevant to the research objectives of the project |                                     | 5  | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Activities to achieve the target state   |   | Indicative questions: Evaluate, based on the description of the original and proposed conditions and planned development activities, the extent to which the development plan of the R&D centre is realistic. Take into consideration, whether or not the original and proposed conditions are specific enough. Provided that the development plan of the R&D centre is in fact realistic, evaluate the extent to which such a plan is ambitious. Take into consideration the extent to which the research goals of the R&D centre correspond to the development plan of the research centre in relevant areas of R&D.   | combined   | evaluating              | 12                     | x   | 23   |  |   |
|   | expediency                                    | V3.2                 | The quality and logical coherence of development activities in the field of the applicant's R&D centre instrumentation  |                                     | 5  | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |   | To what extent can the proposed development activities be considered as logically coherent? To what extent can the development activities be considered as designed for quality - with the potential to achieve the target state in R&D centre instrumentation? Consider how much the research agenda of the project is in accordance with the developmental activities of the R&D centre instrumentation.   |  |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |
|   | expediency                                    | V3.3                 | The quality and logical coherence of development activities in the field of the applicant's R&D centre research capacities  |                                     | 5  | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities<br>- Description of the research activities of the nominated team members |   | To what extent can the proposed development activities be considered as logically coherent? To what extent can the development activities be considered as designed for quality - with the potential to achieve the target state in R&D centre research capacities? Consider how much the staffing of the project is in accordance with the developmental activities of the R&D centre in research capacities and their management. To what extent is the objective of the proposed development activities in the field of management, evaluation and remuneration of human resources, achieving a status comparable with relevant institutions in the field abroad. |  |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |
|   | expediency                                    | V3.4                 | The quality and logical coherence of development activities in the field of the applicant's R&D centre international  |                                     | 5  | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Activities to achieve the target state   |   | To what extent can the proposed development activities be considered as logically coherent? To what extent can the development activities be considered as designed for quality - with the potential to achieve the target state in R&D centre international cooperation? Consider how much the research agenda of the project is in accordance with the developmental activities of the R&D centre international cooperation.   |  |                         |                        |   |  | evaluating   | x |



**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name     | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name   | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information  | evaluator | instructions for evaluators/leading questions  | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|-----------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
|                         | expediency                                    | V3.5                 | The quality and relevance of the strategic foreign cooperating entity/entities is evaluated by means of comparison with relevant institutions abroad.                      |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Activities to achieve the target state |           | Indicative questions: To what extent is the level of strategic foreign cooperating entity (SFCE) or entities comparable with relevant institutions in the field abroad? Consider how the is SFCE relevant to the development objectives of the R&D centre? Consider the SZSS's level of involvement in the implementation of the research agenda of the project and the involvement of SFCE key people in the advisory body of the R&D centre. Consider how much the SFCE has real potential to significantly enhance the success of the R&D centre in gaining international grant funding.  |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                         | expediency                                    | V3.6                 | The benefits of the project implementation (and achieving the target state) for the region, Czech Republic, EU.  |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | The extent to which the project has the potential to positively affect the region, Czech Republic and the EU? To what extent does the project affect the effective transfer of knowledge from abroad to the region? Consider the potential of the project to strengthen the capacity of the region to create an internationally competitive quality.   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
| project research agenda | usefulness                                    | V4.1                 | Quality and potential of the project research plan   |                                     | 15   | 75                       | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent do the research goals of the project represent contemporary and disciplinary matters – deal with contemporary scientific problems in the given discipline or 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 activities potentially produce scientific output, which comparable to scientific output of similar institutions abroad? To what extent is oriented fundamental research a topic of the research agenda - research to create knowledge with the potential to produce relevant results? Consider whether the proposed research activities have the potential to contribute to the development of the current state of knowledge in the field - if they have the nature of frontier research. | combined                | combined               | 39  | 9  | 56   |
|                         | usefulness                                    | V4.2                 | Relevance of research activities and methodical approaches to meeting the research objectives of the project   |                                     | 15   |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent are research activities and methodological approaches to the research agenda relevant to meeting the research objectives of the project? Consider how much do research activities and methodological approaches represent the most effective way of implementation research agenda in terms of expended resources.  |                         | combined               |   | 9  |  |
|                         | efficiency                                    | V4.3                 | The degree of complementarity and thematic compliance of research objectives of the project with respect to the existing research activities of the applicant's R&D centre |                                     | 15   |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent are the research objectives and research activities of the project complementary to existing research activities in the R&D 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 coherence of research objectives and research activities of the project with the existing research activities of the R&D centre?  |                         | combined               |   | 9  |  |
|                         | efficiency / effectiveness                    | V4.4                 | Ambitiousness of the outcome and results of the project and how realistic is its completion in time of the project milestones.   |                                     | 15   |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | Evaluate how realistic 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 realistic enough, evaluate the extent to which such output and results are ambitious. Evaluate the extent to which the accomplishment of target values of monitoring indicators is realistic. Provided that the target values of monitoring indicators are realistic 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 and the project's research activities.   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                         | expediency                                    | V4.5                 | The necessity and justification of new instrumentation and material-technical equipment and possibly completion to fulfill the research objectives of the project          |                                     | 15   |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | Consider how much the acquired instrumentation and material-technical equipment for the project, together with the existing R&D centre equipment, necessary for the fulfillment of the objectives of the research project. To what extent is the need of instrumentation and material-technical equipment sufficiently justified? Consider, whether the utilization rate of the acquired instrumentation and material-technical equipment justifies its acquisition, for implementing the research agenda.   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
| staffing                | feasibility                                   | V5.1                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of scientific publications.  |                                     | 15   | 70                       | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities     |           | To what extent is the H-index value of the KFR comparable with other top scientists in their research field? Decide if journals, in which the KFR published its 10 best publications, are considered high quality journals, taking into consideration the IF of the journals. To what extent does the amount of citations (exclusive of auto-citations) of 10 best KFR publications 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. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)   | combined                | combined               | 35  | 9  | 56   |

**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name   | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information  | evaluator | instructions for evaluators/leading questions   | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |
|---------------------|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|-----------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.2                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of research monographs.  |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to research monographs correspond to the success of leading scientists in the relevant field? Consider the extent and type of KFR authorship, and the quality of peer-review evaluation of research monographs (evaluators quality). (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)  |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.3                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in the field of invited lectures at leading international conferences in the field.               |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to invited talks correspond to the success of leading scientists in the relevant field? Consider the extent to which it is possible to treat the given conferences as the leading in the field. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.4                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of scientific awards.  |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to scientific awards correspond to the success of leading scientists in the relevant field? Consider the extent to which scientific awards in the field can be considered as prestigious in the field. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)  |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.5                 | Results for foreign researcher achieved in the last 5 years in organizing committees for the leading international conferences in the field during the last 5 years. |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | Indicative questions: To what extent is the KFR involvement in organizational committees of leading international conferences comparable with similar activities of leading scientists in the field? Consider the extent to which it is possible to treat the given conferences as the leading in the field, and consider the role of a worker for the organization of conferences. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)  |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.6                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of teaching and management of student work.  |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to teaching and management of student work correspond to the success of leading scientists in the relevant field? Consider the number of graduates in every type of educational programme (Mgr./Ing./M.Sc., Ph.D.) and the content of led courses. Consider how much a university or college, implementing a training programme, can be regarded as a leading educational institution in the international context? (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013) |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.7                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of obtaining grant funding.  |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to obtaining grant funding correspond to the success of leading scientists in the relevant field? Take into account the difficulty of grant competition, in which the KFR has succeeded and the amount of grant funded that was awarded. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)  |                         | combined               |   | 3  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.8                 | Results of the foreign key researcher achieved in the last 5 years in terms of patents and co-operation with industry.   |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent does success of the KFR with regard to obtaining patents and co-operating with the industry correspond to the success of leading scientists 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. (Last 5 years = 2009 - 2013)  |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.9                 | Relevance and coherence of existing research activities of a key foreign researcher in research projects of the project research agenda.                             |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities                                   |           | To what extent are previous research activities of the KFR relevant to research aims, agenda and activities of the project? Consider the potential that previous research activities of the KFR have to successfully achieve the aims of the research agenda of the project.  |                         | evaluating             |   |  |  |
|                     | feasibility                                   | V5.10                | Concept of the research team, balance of expertise, roles, employment contracts and their relevance to achieving the research agenda of the project.                 |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of the research activities of the nominated team members |           | 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?   |                         | combined               |   | 3  |  |

**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name   | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name   | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information  | evaluator | instructions for evaluators/leading questions   | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |
|---|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|-----------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
|   | feasibility                                   | V5.11                | Quality of the nominated members of the research team, relevance of their previous research activities in research projects of research agenda projects. |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Research team CV incl. KFR<br>- Description of the research activities of the nominated team members             |           | 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 of the project.           |                         | combined               |   | 3  |  |
|   | feasibility                                   | V5.12                | Organizational integration of a key foreign researcher and the research team into the structure the applicant's R & D centre.                            |                                     | 5  |                          | annex:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | Consider how the integration of a key foreign researcher and the research team into the structure of the R&D is efficient from to viewpoint of integration of research activities of the project to existing research activities of the centre. To what extent does the key foreign researcher - head of the research team<br>- have independence in making personnel decisions of the research team, including remuneration? To what extent has a key foreign researcher - leading the research team<br>- independence in the management and coordination of the R&D activities of the research team? Consider the scope of key foreign researcher competences - leading the research team - in the handling of funds obtained in international grant competitions.  |                         | combined               |   | 3  |  |
| motivation of the key foreign researcher  | efficiency                                    | V6.1                 | KFR's motivation to build a long-term management of the research team in the Czech Republic.   |                                     | 25   | 25                       | annex:<br>- motivational letter<br>- KFR employment contract draft<br>- Description of research activities  |           | Assess the degree of the degree of motivation of a key foreign researcher to build a long-term management of the research team in the Czech Republic. In the case of simultaneous KFR employments with other institutions, consider, how effectively the employment of the worker in the R&D centre will be implemented. Consider how much the employment of the foreign researcher in the amount of 0.5 FTE is sufficient to fulfill the developmental and research objectives of the project and the achievement of planned outputs and results.  | evaluating              | evaluating             | x   | x  | 19   |
| ERC   | expediency                                    | V7.1                 | Was the key foreign researcher successful in obtaining grant funds in one of the programmes of the European Research Council (ERC)?                      |                                     | 25   | 25                       | annex:<br>- Feasibility study<br>- Description of research activities   |           | Was the key foreign researcher successful in obtaining grant funds in one of the programmes of the European Research Council (ERC)? Specifically, either: a) gained some of ERC grants as a principal investigator of the project, or b) succeeded as a principal investigator in two rounds of evaluation performed by ERC expert panels, and the outcome of the evaluation was closed by the verdict of the international panel of ERC evaluators: "The proposal is of good quality and fundable but not retained for funding due to budgetary constraints", or with a similar statement, from which it is unambiguously clear that the project passed the second round of evaluation by international ERC boards, that it is financially supportable, but support could no be granted in the final stage of European funds because of a lack of available ERC funds. | evaluating              | evaluating             | x   | x  | 19   |
| Results and outputs   | expediency                                    | V8.1                 | Appropriateness of selected indicators of outputs and results  |                                     | 5  | 5                        | grant application:<br>- Indicators<br><br>annexes:<br>- Overview of the key outputs of the project fulfillment of indicators<br>- Feasibility study |           | It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.<br><br>(Assessing the relevance of results and outputs with respect to their practical use.)  | combined                | combined               | 2   | 2  | 4  |
| 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                                       | V9.1                 | The adequacy and efficiency of payroll costs of the foreign key scientist and his research team.   |                                     | 10   | 50                       | grant application:<br>- Budget<br>- Time schedule<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study  |           | To what extent do the labour costs of the foreign key foreign scientist and his research team correspond to the needs of the research agenda and the achievement of the project aims during the period of implementation? Take into consideration if the labour costs correspond to employment contracts of the scientific staff 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 foreign key research employee and the research team motivating considering national and international competition in the area of human resources for R&D?<br><br>In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.  |                         | evaluating             | 20  | x  | 38   |
|   | economy                                       | V9.2                 | The adequacy and efficiency of the cost of the instrument and material-technical equipment.  |                                     | 10   |                          | grant application:<br>Budget<br>CBA (FA)<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent do the expenses of the instrument and material and technical equipment correspond to the project research aims during the period of implementation? Consider how much the cost of the instrument and material-technical equipment corresponds to normal prices for the equipment of a similar nature.<br><br>In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |

**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name      | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name   | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information   | evaluator | instructions for evaluators/leading questions   | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |            |   |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-----------|---|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|------------|---|
|                          | economy                                       | V9.3                 | The adequacy and efficiency of operating costs.  |                                     | 10   | 10                       | grant application:<br>- Budget<br>- CBA (FA)<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study  |           | To what extent do the other operating expenses (beyond labour costs) correspond to the needs of the research agenda to achieve the aims, during the period of implementation? Consider, if the costs are proportionate to the use of equipment and related infrastructure of the R&D centre.<br><br>In case that expense do not comply the 3E rule, evaluator formulates objection and suggests cuts to the budget.   |                         | evaluating             | 2   | x  |  |            |   |
|                          | economy                                       | V9.4                 | How ambitious (and concurrently how realistic is) is the amount of income from international grant resources.  |                                     | 10   |                          | grant application:<br>- Budget<br>- CBA (FA)<br><br>annexes:<br>Feasibility study  |           | Consider, having regard to the objectives of the project period sustainability, how realistic is the value of the planned revenue amount from international competition grants. Provided that the value of income amount is realistic enough, evaluate the extent to which such an amount is ambitious. Consider the potential of a key foreign scientist and his research team to obtain grant funding.  |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |
|                          | economy                                       | V9.5                 | How realistic 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. |                                     | 10   |                          | grant application:<br>- Budget<br>CBA (FA)<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study  |           | Consider, having regard to the objectives of the project period sustainability, how realistic is the amount of other income (income other than income from international grant competitions). Consider, having regard to information about the structure and nature of R&D centre funding in the past, how realistic is the planned structure and character of other revenues.  |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |
| financing of the project | expediency                                    | V10.1                | General conditions for expenditure eligibility   |                                     | 5  | 10                       | grant application:<br>- Budget   |           | The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, i.e. the material, local and temporal eligibility of expenditure in the budget.<br><br>In the event that the grant application contains an ineligible expenditure, the evaluator proposes its elimination from the budget.<br><br>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 support grant application | combined                | evaluating             | 2   | x  | 8  |            |   |
|                          | economy                                       | V10.2                | Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.   |                                     | 5  |                          | grant application:<br>- Financial resources overview   |           | It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.  |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |
| Technical feasibility    | effectiveness / efficiency                    | V11.1                | Utilization of existing equipment and related infrastructure of the applicant's R&D centre for the needs of the project.   |                                     | 5  | 25                       | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent the existing instrumentation and related infrastructure of the R&D centre will be used for implementation of the project's research agenda? Consider the effectiveness and efficiency of existing equipment and related infrastructure for the implementation of the research agenda.  | combined                | evaluating             | 10  | x  | 19   |            |   |
|                          | feasibility                                   | V11.2                | The suitability and readiness of the applicant's R&D centre environment for the location of the research team and implementing the research agenda of the project.                       |                                     | 5  |                          | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | Assess the extent to which the applicant's R&D centre environment is ready for the research team being based there and implementing the research agenda of the project. Consider, whether the deployed team in the areas of the R&D centre meets the needs of teamwork and the efficient implementation of research activities.   |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |
|                          | feasibility                                   | V11.3                | Plan and time schedule feasibility of public procurement procedures for instrumentation purchase.  |                                     | 5  |                          | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study   |           | To what extent is the plan and time schedule of instrumentation procurement procedures feasible given the time frame of the project implementation. Consider how much the plan is in line with the recruitment of scientific workers to the research team and the implementation of research activities of the research agenda of the project.  |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |
|                          | feasibility                                   | V11.4                | How realistic are the plan and the time schedule of recruitment of the research employees to the research project.   |                                     | 5  |                          | grant application:<br>- Project description<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study -<br>Description of the research activities of the nominated team members |           | To what extent is the plan and time schedule for the recruitment of researchers to the research team realistic given the time frame of the project. Consider how much the plan is in line with the implementation of procurement procedures for the purchase of instrumentation and the implementation of research activities of the research agenda of the project.  |                         |                        |   |  |  | evaluating | x |

**Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation**

| root criterion name | quality aspect of the project - sub-criterion      | sub-criterion number | Sub-criterion name   | sub-criteria evaluation description | evaluation method - yes/no or point amount - sub-criterion | point score of criterion | main source of information   | evaluator | instructions for evaluators/leading questions  | 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 evaluators for the use of an arbitrator - root criteria |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-----------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
|                     | efficiency   | V11.5                | 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:<br>- Project description<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study               |           | 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?   |                         | evaluating             |   | x  |  |
| horizontal themes   | Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects | V12.1                | Activities promoting equal opportunities   |                                     | yes/no   | x                        | grant application:<br>- Horizontal principles  |           | 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               | exclusion              | x   | x  | x  |
|                     | Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects | V12.2                | Activities supporting a sustainable development  |                                     | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Horizontal principles  |           | 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.<br><br><i>If applicable:</i> The grant application shall include an environmental indicator output ( "Extended, renovated or newly built capacities without the annexation of agricultural land." ).<br><br><i>If applicable:</i> It will be checked whether or not the project is implemented on parcels that extend into the territory of specially protected areas or NATURA 2000 areas. (Http://mapy.nature.cz/p://mapy.nature.cz/, application mapomat, tab nature protection. It is necessary to cross the layers of the given nature protection and landscapes and layers of cadastral maps).  |                         | exclusion              |   | x  | x  |
|                     | Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects | V12.3                | Activities supporting non-discrimination   |                                     | yes/no   |                          | grant application:<br>- Horizontal principles  |           | It is evaluated, whether there is no project to discriminate certain groups.   |                         | exclusion              |   | x  | x  |
| sustainability      | economy  | V13.1                | Sustainability   |                                     | 5  | 5                        | grant application:<br>- Project description<br>- CBA (FA)<br><br>annexes:<br>- Feasibility study |           | 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.<br><br>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 realistic.<br><br>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 expansion of the research team as a reaction to the achievement of specific outputs and results within the sustainability period. Consider whether the development plan of the research team responds to possible team aging. To what extent is the plan for personnel team development in accordance with development activities in the R&D research centre capacity of the applicant.<br><br>This applies mandatorily to all projects and investments in infrastructure or productive investments, projects supported by the ERDF, major projects and others in case of need defined by the call. | evaluating              | evaluating             | x   | x  | 4  |



