

AGREED

APPROVED

By the Supervisory Board  
of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine  
(minutes of the meeting of 06.10.2023 No. 21)

By the decision of the Scientific Council  
of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine  
(minutes of the meeting of August 25, 2023 No. 21

as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU of  
26.10.2023, minutes No. 28)

## **The Procedure for conducting scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine**

### General terms

1. The procedure for carrying out scientific and scientific-technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter - the Procedure) was developed in accordance with the Law of Ukraine "On Scientific and Scientific and Technical Activity", the Law of Ukraine "On Scientific and scientific and technical review", Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated July 4, 2018 No. 528 "On the National Research Foundation of Ukraine" (with amendments) and Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated December 27, 2019 No. 1170 "On approval of the Procedure for competitive selection and financing of projects by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (*as amended by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated July 4, 2023 No. 742*) (hereinafter referred to as the Procedure for Competitive Selection).
2. This Procedure defines the procedure for scientific and scientific-technical reviewing (hereinafter - reviewing) of projects and consideration of applications for grant support (hereinafter - application) submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter - the Foundation) for participation in calls of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter – the/a call), and also determines the procedure for joint selection of projects with a foreign and/or international foundation, society, institution, organization, association which will be performed jointly by Ukrainian and foreign legal entities, foreign (international) scientific societies, by institutions, organizations, associations within the framework of international bilateral and/or multilateral scientific and scientific-technical cooperation (hereinafter - joint competitive selection of projects).

The basis for joint competitive selection of projects is an agreement between the Foundation and a foreign foundation, society, institution, organization, association on a joint call and project financing.

The provisions of this Procedure apply to the joint competitive selection of projects in accordance with the agreement between the Foundation and a foreign foundation, society, institution, organization, association on holding a joint call and financing projects, unless otherwise provided for in the agreement between the Foundation and a foreign foundation, society, institution, organization, association on a joint call and project financing.

The joint terms and conditions for a joint call for projects are defined in the agreement between the Foundation and a foreign foundation, society, institution, organization, association on the joint call and project financing.

The decision to conduct a joint call for projects is made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

The joint competitive selection of projects is carried out taking into account this Procedure.

3. The main principles of project reviewing and consideration of applications are the following:

- maximum openness and transparency;
- independence and objectivity of scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects in the areas of grant support of the Foundation (hereinafter – the/a project);
- competence and objectivity of the persons conducting the reviewing;
- taking into account the world level of scientific and technical progress;
- responsibility for the reliability and completeness of the analysis, the validity of the reviewer's recommendations;
- respect for copyright and related rights, as well as compliance with the principles of research ethics;
- compliance with the principles of fair call;
- prevention of conflict of interests during the consideration and reviewing of projects.

4. In this Procedure, concepts have the following meanings:

Registration number – a numeric identifier assigned to the application during the competitive selection for awarding grant support at the expense of the state budget. It remains unchanged for the application during the competitive selection;

Thematic Panel (Panel) – a group of members of the Call Commission, formed according to the thematic areas of a specific call, consisting of at least five people: it ensures the process of consideration and reviewing of projects of the relevant thematic direction;

Curator – a member of the Call Commission, authorized by the decision of the Call Commission to provide constant support for the identified projects (from the selection of reviewers to the determination of the results of the call);

The author of the project is a researcher from the side of the applicant (call participant) and a researcher from the partner side (in case of involvement) mentioned in the application;

Referent – an employee of the Directorate of the Foundation, designated by the Directorate for organizational and technical support of the application submitted for the call, from the moment of its receipt until the completion of the work of the Call Commission;

Arbitrator – a member of the Scientific Council of the Foundation, elected by the Scientific Council of the relevant section for communication between the Call Commission and the Scientific Council of the section at all stages of consideration and reviewing of projects, supervision of compliance with the terms and conditions of the call and the requirements for the procedures specified in this Procedure;

Observer – a member of the Scientific Council of the Foundation, elected by the Scientific Council of the relevant section for ongoing monitoring of the process of consideration and reviewing of applications for compliance with established requirements, rules and procedures and immediate notification of the Arbiter about their violation;

Foreign reviewer – a reviewer who has been working outside of Ukraine for at least last 5 years. Confirmation of the reviewer's work outside Ukraine is considered to be the fact that only institutions outside Ukraine are indicated in all research publications by the reviewer indexed in scientometric databases and search engines as a place of work (affiliation) during the last 5 years. A reviewer cannot be a researcher who works/has worked in (is/has been affiliated) an institution of the Russian Federation and/or Belarus in any period since 2014.

Sending the project to a reviewer for conducting scientific and scientific and technical reviewing (hereinafter - reviewing) - an official request sent through the electronic information system of the Foundation for the submission and processing of projects (hereinafter referred to as the electronic system of the Foundation) or by e-mail to a potential reviewer with a proposal to review the project, indicating the name, abstract and list of authors of the project, and the term during which the reviewer is proposed to give consent for the reviewing;

The reviewer's consent to the reviewing – confirmation of acceptance by a potential reviewer of the proposal to conduct a scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of the project in accordance with the requirements of this Procedure, sent by e-mail or through the electronic system of the Foundation;

Reviewer's opinion – a summarized result of the scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of the project compiled according to the established form which contains numerical evaluations (score) according to all the established terms and conditions of the call, evaluation criteria and textual justification of these evaluations, and meets the requirements for completeness, reasonableness and reliability;

Confidential call information – information contained in the call selection materials and in the Foundation's electronic system, as well as information regarding the details of project discussions at the meetings of the Call Commission or Panels, with the exception of:

- information that is publicly available;
- titles, annotations and lists of project authors.

Other terms are used in the sense they are used in the Law of Ukraine 'On Scientific and Scientific-Technical Activities' and in the Procedure for Competitive Selection.

### **Submission and registration of applications**

5. Applications are submitted and registered in accordance with clauses 10-18 of the Procedure for Competitive Selection and this Procedure, unless otherwise stipulated by an agreement between the Foundation and a foreign Foundation, company, institution, organization, association on a joint call and project financing.
6. Applications and documents for participation in the call are submitted in electronic form in Ukrainian or in Ukrainian and English depending on the requirements stipulated by the terms and conditions of the call, with a mandatory note about the consent of the authors of the project to its implementation.
7. Substitution or addition of clarifications to submitted documents by the participant of the call after the deadline specified in the announcement of the call is not allowed.
8. Requirements for the format of documents, including their scanned copies, and the method of their submission on the website of the Foundation when submitting applications in electronic form are determined by the terms and conditions of the call.
9. Only those applications that are submitted for the call within the period specified in the call announcement are subject to registration.
10. Registration of the application is carried out by the Directorate of the Foundation, with information being entered into the electronic system of the Foundation.
11. During registration, each application is assigned a corresponding registration number.
12. The participant of the call is informed about the registration of the application and its acceptance for preliminary consideration (automatically when submitting the application online or within one working day by the Directorate of the Foundation by e-mail).

### **Consideration and reviewing of applications**

13. The consideration and reviewing of applications is carried out in accordance with clauses 19–26 of the Procedure for competitive selection, this Procedure, unless otherwise stipulated by an agreement between the Foundation and a foreign Foundation, company, institution, organization, association on conducting a joint call and financing projects, taking into account the requirements of the Regulation on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflict of interests during competitive selection, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation, as well as in accordance with the Regulations on the Call Commission (Appendix 1 to these Procedures), and the terms and conditions of the call, determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation in the decision on launching the call.
14. The Scientific Council of the Foundation does not interfere in the work of the Call Commission and does not take direct part in the process of consideration and reviewing of projects. In accordance with subparagraph 5 of paragraph 19 of the Regulation on the National Research Foundation of

Ukraine, approved by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated July 4, 2018 No. 528 (as amended), the Scientific Council of the Foundation exercises control over the implementation of its decisions.

In order to control compliance with the requirements of this Procedure and the Regulation on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflicts of interest during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation, the Scientific Council of the Foundation shall no later than two working days before the deadline for accepting applications, chooses one Arbitrator and two Observers for each Panel from among its members. Arbitrators and Observers must notify the Call Commission and the Scientific Council of the Foundation in writing about the absence or existence of a conflict of interest with the authors of the applications no later than five working days after the deadline for submission of applications.

Observers are authorized to carry out regular monitoring of the course of the call at all stages of consideration and reviewing of projects in order to prevent and promptly eliminate possible violations. If violations are detected, the Observers shall immediately inform the Arbiter and, if necessary, the Head of the Foundation. Observers do not directly interact with the members of the Call Commission and do not participate in the meetings of the Call Commission.

Arbitrators are authorized to supervise the Commission's compliance with the requirements of this Procedure, as well as the requirements of the Regulation on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflicts of interest during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects, and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation.

Since access to the electronic system of the Foundation is provided exclusively on the basis of confidentiality, the members of the Call Commission within five working days from the moment of their election sign and submit to the Directorate of the Foundation a corresponding commitment not to disclose confidential information (including confidential call information).

Arbitrators and Observers sign a corresponding commitment to non-disclosure of confidential information after their election to the scientific councils of the Foundation's sections.

The Arbitrator has the right to participate in the meetings of the Call Commission and Panels (without the right to vote). Based on the Arbiter's well-founded submission, the Scientific Council of the Foundation applies to the head of the Call Commission to respond to cases of possible violations detected during the consideration and reviewing of projects.

In possible violations are detected (both independently and at the request of the Observers), the Arbitrator is obliged to contact the Chairman of the Panel in writing (by e-mail) regarding consideration and response to the violation. Copies of such an appeal are simultaneously sent to the Chairman of the Call Commission.

In the event of an unsatisfactory response to the detected possible violations within three working days from the moment the Arbiter sends the relevant appeal to the Chairman of the Panel, the Arbiter shall address a corresponding submission to the head of the Scientific Council of the Foundation regarding the response to the fact of the violation(s).

15. The Directorate of the Foundation, within the framework of providing organizational support for conducting and organizing calls by the Foundation, within 10 working days from the date of the end of the application submission period, checks them for compliance with formal requirements (does the eligibility check).

The basis for rejection of an application on formal grounds is the non-compliance of the application submitted by the applicant with the form established by the Foundation, the absence of documents provided for by the terms and conditions of the call; absence or incomplete provision of the information provided by the terms and conditions of the call in the documents submitted by the participant of the call; inconsistency of the information submitted in the application with the requirements defined in the terms and conditions of the call.

The Foundation's directorate informs the relevant call participant about the rejection of applications on formal grounds in electronic form within three working days after the deadline for checking applications for compliance with formal grounds.

Within 10 working days from the date of completion of the Directorate's checking (eligibility check) of applications for compliance with formal grounds, the Call Commission conducts their preliminary review regarding compliance with the conditions of the call, in particular, the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, detection of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the call participant.

The non-compliance of the documents submitted by the applicant with the terms and conditions of the call, in particular with the criteria for the selection of projects determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the discovery of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the applicant are the basis for withdrawing the application from consideration based on the results of its preliminary review.

Detection of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the applicant is grounds for withdrawing the application from consideration during the entire period of competitive selection.

Based on the results of the preliminary review of applications for compliance with the conditions of the call, in particular the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, in the event that inaccurate information is found in the documents submitted by the participant of the call, the Call Commission approves the list of applications that are withdrawn from consideration. The directorate of the Foundation notifies the relevant call participant in electronic form no later than three working days after the adoption of the decision of the Call Commission to withdraw the application from consideration on the basis of non-compliance with the conditions of the call, in particular the criteria by which projects are selected, determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the discovery of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the call participant.

16. For each application recognized as meeting the requirements, the Call Commission, within no more than two working days from the date of completion of their preliminary review, on the proposal of the Panel, determines two Curators who will be responsible for accompanying the application throughout the entire competitive selection.

Each Curator informs in writing about the absence of a conflict of interests with the authors of the corresponding project by submitting a statement according to the established template.

Curators search for potential reviewers for the projects assigned to them using reviewer search systems the use of which is approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation (the relevant decision must be made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation before the announcement of the call). The

primary criteria for the selection and rating of potential reviewers (formation of the rating list of potential reviewers) are the correspondence of their area of expertise to the subject of the project and the general scientific level, confirmed by research degrees and relevant scientific publications.

At the proposal of the Curators, the Call Commission, within eight working days from the date of selection of the Curators, forms and approves a rating list of potential reviewers for each application. The list is to contain at least five potential reviewers, taking into account the subject of the project, the terms and conditions of the call, and the requirements of the Regulation on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflict of interests during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation.

If the terms and conditions of the call provide for the mandatory involvement of foreign reviewers to conduct the reviewing, then there must be at least one foreign reviewer in the top three of the rating list of potential reviewers.

Requests for reviewing are sent to potential reviewers in such a sequence as to satisfy the conditions of the call in terms of the involvement of Ukrainian and foreign reviewers.

The members of the Call Commission do not have the right to review the projects submitted for participation in the respective call.

Members of the Foundation's management bodies, as well as authors of projects submitted for participation in the call, do not have the right to review the projects of the respective call.

The Call Commission, with the technical and organizational support of the Referent, no later than within five working days from the date of approval by the Call Commission of the rating lists of potential reviewers, drawn up taking into account the terms and conditions of the call regarding the involvement of foreign reviewers (if this is provided for by the terms and conditions of the call), sends the project for reviewing (sends a request for reviewing) to the first three potential reviewers on the rating list.

Simultaneously with sending a request for reviewing in the electronic system of the Foundation, the Referents communicate with potential reviewers using the means of communication specified in the reviewer's personal profile by sending text messages.

In the event that the potential reviewer to whom the request for reviewing was sent did not respond, then on the third working day the Referent, using the means of communication indicated in the personal profile of the reviewer (by sending text messages), communicates with the potential reviewer again with a request to respond within two working days.

If, after sending requests for reviewing to the first three potential reviewers, the required number of reviewers is not recruited, then a request for a reviewing is sent to the respective number of reviewers so that the number is enough for reviewing of the project (according to the terms and conditions of the call).

The reviewers' consents to the reviewing are registered by the Referents, after which the Curators form a group of reviewers (in the number and composition stipulated by the terms and conditions of the call) who will conduct the project reviewing.

If the ranking list of potential reviewers approved by the Call Commission for a certain application is exhausted before three reviewers have given their consent, then the Call Commission forms and approves an additional ranking list of potential reviewers, containing at least three potential reviewers (depending on the conditions of the call), no later than within three working days.

The maximum number of applications that can be evaluated by one reviewer is determined by the Call Commission, but cannot exceed 6 applications within one call and 15 applications within all calls held by the Foundation in a calendar year. All cases of exceeding the level of 6 applications for one reviewer within one call require the approval of the Arbitrator and the Head of the relevant section of the Scientific Council of the Foundation or the Head of the NRFU

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

17. Ukrainian reviewer, when giving consent to do the reviewing, provides the following documents and information in the electronic system of the Foundation:

- 1) a document certifying the award of a research degree (scan-copy) or leaving a mark in the electronic system of the Foundation;
- 2) a statement on the absence of a conflict of interest (a scanned copy following the established template);
- 3) consent to sign a civil-legal contract for conducting scientific and scientific-technical review (mark in the Foundation's electronic system);
- 4) obligations regarding confidentiality (mark in the electronic system of the Foundation);
- 5) a statement on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflict of interests during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation (mark in the Foundation's electronic system);
- 6) statement on familiarization with the requirements of this Procedure (mark in the electronic system of the Foundation).

If the reviewing is carried out on a paid basis, the reviewer provides:

- a paper version of a civil-law contract for conducting scientific and scientific-technical review signed on his/her side or an electronic version of a civil-law contract for conducting scientific and scientific-technical review signed on his/her side with an electronic signature (hereinafter - ES);
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the document certifying the award of a research degree;
- a statement on the absence of a conflict of interest (following the established template);
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the passport of a citizen of Ukraine;
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the taxpayer's card;
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of a certificate from a Ukrainian bank (with current account details in Ukrainian hryvnias).



If the reviewing is carried out pro bono, the reviewer provides:

- a paper version of a civil-law contract for scientific and scientific-technical reviewing signed on his/her side or an electronic version of a civil-law contract for scientific and scientific-technical reviewing signed with the ES;
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the document certifying the award of a research degree;
- a statement on the absence of conflict of interest (following the established template);
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the passport of a citizen of Ukraine;
- self-certified paper or ES-certified electronic copy of the taxpayer's card.

A foreign reviewer, when giving consent to do the reviewing under the conditions specified in the accession agreement in the electronic system of the Foundation, informs the Call Commission about the absence of conflict of interests with the authors of the project, and also confirms the correspondence of his/her field of expertise to the thematic field of the project and the fact that he/she is familiar with the requirements of this Procedure, the requirements of the Regulation on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflicts of interest during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for receiving grant support submitted to the Foundation, and provides a scan a copy of the document certifying the award of a research degree, or leaving a mark in the electronic system of the Foundation. If a foreign reviewer is a citizen of Ukraine, he/she can do the reviewing on a paid basis, provided that he/she provides the same list of documents as defined above in the same paragraph for Ukrainian reviewers.

**Note.**

*The last sentence of Clause 17 of this Procedure shall be enforced from the date of entry into force of the regulatory act regulating the involvement of foreign reviewers in the conduct of scientific and scientific and technical review at the expense of the state budget.*

The Curator provides the project for reviewing through the electronic system of the Foundation no later than within two working days to the reviewer who has given consent to the reviewing, as well as all the necessary documents and information.

If the reviewer is not yet registered as a user in the electronic system of the Foundation, the Referent instructs and advises the reviewer on the actions necessary for such registration.

In addition to access to the project materials, the reviewer is provided with methodological recommendations for preparing the reviewer's opinion, as well as the official e-mail address of the Foundation and the e-mail address of the Head of the Foundation.

If the Reviewer at any stage of the reviewing believes that he/she is being pressured or interfered with his/her work by the members of the Call Commission or other persons, he/she must immediately notify the Head of the Foundation in writing, in particular by e-mail.

Reviewers must immediately notify the Head of the Foundation in writing, in particular by e-mail, of any attempts of pressure or interference by other persons in the work of the members of the Call Commission.

18. The purpose of the reviewing of the application is to draw up a well-grounded opinion by the reviewer regarding the quality of the project and the ability of the participant of the call to perform it at the appropriate level. The opinion is to be made in accordance with the criteria and evaluation form approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

Reviewing and competitive selection of projects is carried out by the Foundation taking into account the Regulations on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflicts of interest during competitive selection, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the Foundation and this Procedure.

The criteria and form of evaluation of projects by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (Methodical support for the reviewing) are in Appendix 2 to this Procedure.

19. The project reviewing is carried out by reviewers within twenty-one calendar days from the date they receive access to the project materials. Based on the results of the reviewing, the reviewer prepares a reviewer's opinion which is submitted through the electronic system of the Foundation.

Curators shall check the reviewer's opinion for completeness, reliability, and reasonableness no later than within two working days from the time the reviewer's opinion is submitted to the electronic system of the Foundation. The reviewer's opinion is considered accepted for consideration by the Call Commission, subject to the consensus of both Curators regarding its compliance with the established requirements for completeness, reliability and reasonableness.

In the event that the Curators identify deficiencies, the reviewer's opinion is returned for refining (with a mandatory indication of the identified deficiencies) which the reviewer is to carry out no later than within three working days. If, after finalization, the reviewer's opinion, in the opinion of the Curators, still does not meet the requirements of completeness, reliability and reasonableness, then the matter is referred to the Panel for consideration. Within three working days, the panel makes a decision to accept or reject the reviewer's opinion for consideration.

If the Panel decided that the reviewer's opinion cannot be accepted for consideration (does not meet the requirements of completeness, reliability and reasonableness), such a decision is referred to the Call Commission, which makes a final decision within no more than five working days.

If the Call Commission does not accept the reviewer's opinion for consideration, due to the fact that it does not meet the requirements of completeness, reliability and reasonableness, a new reviewer is selected to replace the one whose opinion was not accepted. The new reviewer gives consent to the reviewing within three working days. If such consent is received, he/she is given twenty-one calendar days to carry out the project reviewing.

In communication with reviewers (exclusively through the electronic system of the Foundation), Curators and other members of the Call Commission do not have the right to express their own evaluative judgments about the project but can only indicate specific flaws in the reviewer's opinion (internal contradictions, missing or incomplete justifications, factual errors, etc.) and demand their elimination.

Any communication between Curators and reviewers outside the electronic system of the Foundation is prohibited

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the scientific council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

20. The curators analyze the totality of the received opinions of the reviewers on the project and report on the results at the Panel meeting. If the rate of discrepancy  $R$ , calculated according to the procedure determined by the terms and conditions of the call, does not exceed the critical value established by the terms and conditions of the call, then the final numerical evaluation of the application is considered to be the arithmetic average of the reviewers' conclusions. If the indicator of discrepancy  $R$  exceeds the critical value established by the terms and conditions of the call, then based on the consideration of the project, taking into account the results of the scientific and scientific-technical reviewing and the justified proposals of the Curators, the Panel adopts the proposal for the final numerical evaluation, the procedure for determining which is established by the terms and conditions of the call.

21. After receiving all reviewers' conclusions and making decisions regarding their acceptance for consideration, the Call Commission no later than within ten working days:

- 1) analyzes the projects, taking into account their compliance with the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the results of the project reviewing;
- 2) approves of the recommended amount of funding before forming the list of call winners;
- 3) on the basis of proposals from the Panel, forms a ranking list of projects with information on their numerical score (from the largest value to the smallest) and a list of call winners with an indication of the recommended amount of project financing and its distribution by year within the limits of the Foundation's grant budgets.

If the Call Commission reasonably disagrees with the Panel's proposal regarding the final numerical score of a particular project, it returns the relevant project to the Panel for immediate reconsideration.

After the Panel's reconsideration the Call Commission makes a final decision on the numerical score of this project, taking into account the Panel's proposal.

During the formation of the rating list of projects, the opinion of the reviewer is not taken into account in the event of a detected conflict of interests not declared by the reviewer after the completion of the reviewing.

Within a period of no more than five working days after the Call Commission finalizes the formation of a rating list of projects, the Secretary of the Call Commission draws up a protocol in which he/she notes the results of the reviewing of projects and proposals regarding the rating list of projects and their numerical score.

Attached to the protocol is also a list of projects recommended for implementation at the expense of the Foundation's grant support, and a list of call winners with the indication of the recommended amount of project financing and its distribution by year within the limits of the Foundation's grant budget.

The Call Commission can propose correction of project budgets based on the recommendations of reviewers and communication with project PIs before forming the final list of call winners with an indication of the recommended amount of funding.

22. The results of the call are approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation. If the Scientific Council of the Foundation believes that the determination of the final numerical score of certain projects was made with violation of the procedures specified in this document, it returns the relevant projects to the Call Commission for immediate reconsideration.

23. The decision to approve the results of the call, the list of projects recommended for implementation at the expense of the Foundation's grant support, the amount of their financing, and the rating list of projects indicating the scores of each project are published by the Foundation's directorate on the Foundation's official website no later than within five working days after making such a decision. For projects that are recommended for implementation at the expense of the Foundation's grant support, the full name of the project PI is also made public.

24. Text justification of the scores of the project based on the results of the reviewing is sent by the Foundation's directorate to the respective participant of the call through an electronic cabinet and/or by e-mail no later than within ten working days from the date of approval of the results of the call by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

to the Procedure for conducting scientific and scientific - technical reviewing  
of projects and consideration of applications for grant support  
submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine

## **Regulations on the Call Commission of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine**

### **I. General provisions**

1. The Call Commission of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter referred to as the Call Commission) is created to carry out the competitive selection and organization of evaluation of projects to be financed by the grant support of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter referred to as the Foundation).
2. In its activity, the Call Commission is governed by the Constitution and Laws of Ukraine, acts of the President of Ukraine and of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Procedure for the competitive selection and financing of projects by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, approved by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated December 27, 2019 No. 1170 (*as amended by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated July 4, 2023 No. 742*) (hereinafter referred to as the Procedure), the terms and conditions of a specific call, the Procedure for conducting scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, Regulations on compliance with the principles of research ethics and conflicts of interests prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, other normative legal acts of Ukraine, and these Regulations.
3. The Call Commission ensures a transparent and impartial selection of reviewers who will be involved in the reviewing of the projects, carries out an objective review of the reviewers' conclusions, and also ensures the preparation of proposals to the Scientific Council of the Foundation regarding the rating list of projects.
4. The powers of the Call Commission of the call continue until the completion of the process of concluding grant agreements with the winners of the call.

If, before the conclusion of the process of concluding grant agreements with the winners of the call, the Foundation receives an appeal from one or more winners of the call about the impossibility of starting the project, the Scientific Council of the Foundation applies to the Call Commission for introducing changes to the list of projects recommended for implementation at the expense of grant support from the Foundation and the list of call winners with an indication of the recommended amount of project financing and its distribution by year within the limits of the Foundation's grant budget. In this case, the following changes may be made to the above-mentioned list and the list by the Call Commission: the exclusion of projects for which the respective

appeal was received, and the inclusion, accordingly, of projects that follow the last winner of the call on the general rating list of projects, taking into account the remaining amount of funding for the Call after excluding projects that cannot be implemented

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

5. For the competitive selection of projects to be implemented jointly by Ukrainian and foreign legal entities, foreign (international) scientific societies, institutions, organizations, associations within the framework of international bilateral and/or multilateral scientific and scientific-technical cooperation on the basis of an agreement between the Foundation and a foreign Foundation, society, institution, organization, association for holding a joint call and project financing, the numerical composition, selection procedure and procedure for the Call Commission are determined in accordance with this Procedure and the joint terms and conditions for conducting a joint competitive selection of projects.

The Call Commission acts in accordance with this Procedure, taking into account the Regulations on compliance with the principles of research ethics and conflicts of interests prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine.

## **II. The order of formation, structure and composition of the Call Commission**

1. Within ten working days from the date of posting on the official website of the Foundation the announcement of the call, the Scientific Council of the Foundation section elects at its meeting by open voting the Call Commission from among recognized scientists in the field (with their consent) consisting of at least seven persons. In case of announcing a call common to different sections of the Foundation, the composition of the Call Commission is approved by a jointly agreed proposal of the Scientific Councils of the sections of the Foundation.

Structurally, the Call Commission consists of Thematic Panels (hereinafter referred to as Panels or Call Panels). Panels consisting of at least five persons are formed by the Call Commission from among its members.

The number of Panels is determined by the terms and conditions of the call.

The announcement of the elections of the Call Commission is published on the official website of the Foundation together with the announcement of the call.

The members of the Call Commission are chosen from among recognized scientists in the relevant field (with their consent) taking into account the following main criteria:

- possession of a research degree;
- wide citation of research publications in the relevant field of science;
- high qualification and experience;

- experience of carrying out scientific and scientific - technical reviewing;
- impeccable professional reputation and academic integrity (in particular, if at least two members of the Scientific Council of the Foundation section have objections to a certain candidate due to reasonable doubts about his/her reputation and/or academic integrity, such a candidate is excluded from consideration).

The Scientific Council of the Foundation section may apply additional criteria that cannot conflict the main selection criteria listed above to the members of the Call Commission in order to select the most qualified and experienced candidates.

In order to elect a person to the Call Commission, the respective candidate is to be supported by more than half of the votes of the Scientific Council of the Foundation section.

The following persons cannot become Members of the Call Commission:

- members of the Foundation's governing bodies;
- authors of the projects of the corresponding call.

All members of the Call Commission confirm in writing that they are familiar with the requirements of this Procedure, the requirements of the Regulations on compliance with the principles of research ethics and conflicts of interests prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine. Members of the Call Commission also sign an obligation not to disclose confidential information (including confidential information about the call).

2. Members of the Call Commission at its first meeting which is held no later than five working days before the deadline for submitting applications elect the chairman and deputy chairman of the Call Commission from among their members. The decision is made by open voting by a majority vote of the total composition of the Call Commission. The re-election of the chairman and/or deputy chairman of the Call Commission can be carried out by open voting based on the decision of the majority of the members of the Call Commission at any stage of the call. The election and re-election of the chairman and deputy chairman of the Call Commission can be carried out by holding a meeting online in video conference mode

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

3. Members of the Panels at the first meeting of each Panel which is held no later than five working days before the deadline for submitting applications elect the chairman and deputy chairman of the Panel from among their members by open voting. Re-election of the chairman and/or deputy chairman of the Panel can be carried out by open voting by decision of the majority of the members of the Panel at any stage of the call. The election and re-election of the chairman and/or deputy chairman of the Panel can be carried out by conducting the meeting online in video conference mode

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

4. If necessary, the number of members of the Call Commission and, accordingly, members of the Panels may be increased by no more than a third of the initial composition.

The Scientific Council of the section must make the appropriate decision before determining two Curators who will be responsible for supporting the application throughout the entire competitive selection process.

5. The functions of the secretary of the Call Commission are performed by a designated employee of the Foundation Directorate. The functions of the secretary of the Panel are performed by a designated employee of the Foundation Directorate.

6. For the competitive selection of projects to be implemented jointly by Ukrainian and foreign legal entities, foreign (international) scientific societies, institutions, organizations, associations within the framework of international bilateral and/or multilateral scientific and scientific-technical cooperation on the basis of an agreement between the Foundation and a foreign Foundation, society, institution, organization, association for holding a joint call and project financing, the numerical composition, election procedure and procedure of the call commission are determined in accordance with this Procedure and the terms and conditions of the corresponding joint call.

### **III. Powers of the Call Commission**

#### **1. The Call Commission:**

1) carries out a preliminary review of applications regarding compliance with the terms and conditions of the call, in particular the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, detection of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the participant of the call. Preliminary consideration of applications by the Call Commission takes place within 10 working days after the Foundation's Directorate, within the framework of providing organizational support for the holding and organization of calls by the Foundation, within 10 working days from the date of the application submission deadline, checks them for compliance with formal eligibility criteria. The Foundation's Directorate informs the respective applicant about the rejection in electronic form within three working days after the deadline for checking applications for compliance with formal eligibility criteria.

The non-compliance of the documents submitted by the applicant with the terms and conditions of the call, in particular with the criteria for the selection of projects determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the discovery of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the applicant are the basis for withdrawing the application from consideration based on the results of its preliminary review.

Detection of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the applicant is grounds for withdrawing the application from consideration during the entire period of competitive selection.

Based on the results of the preliminary review of applications for compliance with the terms and conditions of the call, in particular the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, in the event that inaccurate information is detected in the documents submitted by the applicant, the Call Commission approves the list of applications that are withdrawn from consideration. The Directorate of the Foundation notifies the respective applicant of the decision of the Call Commission to withdraw the application from consideration on the basis of non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the call, in particular with the criteria by which projects are selected as determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, and the discovery of inaccurate information in the documents submitted by the call participant. The Directorate of the Foundation notifies the applicant in electronic form no later than three working days after the adoption of such a decision;



- 2) approves the list of projects admitted to the call and distributes these projects among the Panels in accordance with the field of review specified in the application;
  - 3) if the project is submitted or determined by the decision of the Call Commission as interdisciplinary, then the Panel whose subject belongs to the field of knowledge indicated in the application first is responsible for its consideration;
  - 4) determines from among its members two Application Curators based on the proposals of the relevant Panel;
  - 5) forms and approves lists of potential reviewers for each project at the request of the Curators;
  - 6) instructs Referees to communicate with potential reviewers to form the final list of three reviewers for each project (based on their consent), as well as to send projects (sending requests for review) to reviewers for reviewing;
  - 7) suspends reviewers from the reviewing of projects in the event that an undeclared conflict of interest is detected during the reviewing and annuls the reviewer's opinion (conclusion) in the event that an undeclared conflict of interest is detected during or after the completion of the reviewing;
  - 8) manages the work of groups of reviewers (consulting on individual issues of the review, proper preparation by the reviewer of the results of the project review in the form of a conclusion during its preparation);
  - 9) accepts or does not accept the reviewer's opinion for consideration due to compliance/non-compliance with the established requirements for completeness, reliability and reasonableness;
  - 10) on the basis of the reviewing results expressed in score points, forms a rating list of projects with information on their numerical evaluation (from the highest score to the lowest);
  - 11) compiles a list of projects recommended for implementation at the expense of the Foundation's grant support, and a list of call winners, with an indication of the recommended amount of project financing and their distribution by year within the limits of the Foundation's budget, provided for the respective purposes;
  - 12) submits the results of the call for approval by the Scientific Council of the Foundation;
  - 13) performs other functions related to the conduct of calls, determined by the Procedure for Competitive Selection and Financing of Research and Developments Projects by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, the Procedure for conducting scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine and these Regulations on compliance with the principles of research ethics and conflicts of interests prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine.
2. Panels propose Curators of applications, proposals for the list of applications to be withdrawn from consideration on the basis of non-compliance with the criteria by which projects are selected as determined by the terms and conditions of the call, proposals for rating lists of potential reviewers, proposals for accepting the conclusions of reviewers for consideration and proposals for the final numerical scores for projects.

3. Chairperson of the Call Commission:

- 1) chairs the meetings of the Call Commission;
- 2) organizes the work of the Call Commission, convenes meetings of the Call Commission, submits a draft agenda;
- 3) signs the minutes of the meetings of the Call Commission;
- 4) carries out general management of the Call Commission;
- 5) supervises the appropriate and timely response of the head of the Panel to the appeal of the Arbitrator;
- 6) exercises other functions specified by this Regulation.

4. In the absence of the Chairperson of the Call Commission, his functions are performed by his deputy.

5. Members of the Call Commission have the right to:

- 1) make suggestions to the agenda of the meeting of the Call Commission and the meetings of the Panels to which they belong;
- 2) get access to the documents considered at the meeting of the Call Commission, to participate in their preparation and consideration in the time between meetings;
- 3) in agreement with the Chairperson of the Call Commission, to prepare for consideration at the meeting of the Call Commission certain issues necessary for the implementation of its activities, the conduct of the Call, etc.;
- 4) express their opinions and reasoning, as well as provide additional documents and explanations on the issues under consideration;
- 5) sign the minutes of the meeting of the Call Commission and the relevant Panels on the results of the call selection;
- 6) report at the meeting of the Call Commission on the agenda, make proposals, prepare draft decisions of the Call Commission;
- 7) vote on any decision of the Call Commission, except for cases where the Call Commission has decided to exempt its member from voting due to a conflict of interest or other circumstances that affect his/her impartiality;
- 8) express a personal opinion regarding the decisions of the Call Commission;
- 9) recuse himself/herself or refuse to participate in the vote due to a conflict of interest or other circumstances that affect his/her impartiality;
- 10) exercise other functions specified by the Procedure for competitive selection and this Procedure.

6. Secretary of the Call Commission:

- 1) prepares, in agreement with the Chairperson of the Call Commission, drafts of the agenda for the meetings of the Call Commission;

2) makes arrangements for the meetings of the Call Commission, informs the members of the Call Commission about the time, place, mode (online or offline) of the meeting of the Call Commission, carries out other assignments of the Chairman of the Call Commission related to the organization of the meetings of the Call Commission;

3) prepares draft minutes of the Call Commission meetings.

#### 7. Secretary of the Panel:

1) prepares, in agreement with the Chairperson of the Panel, drafts of the agenda of the Panel meetings;

2) makes arrangements for Panel meetings, informs Panel members about the time, place, mode (online or offline) of the meeting, performs other tasks of the Chairperson of the Panel related to the organization of Panel meetings;

3) prepares draft minutes of Panel meetings.

### **IV. Support for the Call Commission's activities**

Organizational and technical support for the activities of the Call Commission is provided by the Directorate of the Foundation.

### **V. Organizational and operating procedures (holding of meetings) of the Call Commission**

1. In order to ensure the transparency of the decision-making process and to prevent conflicts of interest during the reviewing and competitive selection of projects, the members of the Call Commission, after reviewing the list of projects and the list of potential reviewers, must sign a statement claiming they have no conflict of interest.

Each member of the Call Commission who participates in its meeting and has information about any conflict of interest must immediately report it.

In the event of a conflict of interest is detected after a decision of the Call Commission is made, it must meet again for to consider the detected conflict. If there is a conflict of interest, members of the Call Commission determine whether the decision of a member of the Call Commission, in relation to which such a conflict was detected, could have affected the voting results of each of them. If not, the original decision remains in effect. If at least one of the members of the Call Commission thinks that the result of his/her vote could have been influenced by such a conflict, a second vote is held.

The vote of the member of the Call Commission, in relation to which an undeclared conflict of interest was detected, is not taken into account during the second vote. The Scientific Council of the Foundation considers the issue of removing such a member of the Call Commission from further participation in the competitive selection procedure

2. Documents related to the call should be considered documents containing confidential call information.

Referents, members of the Call Commission, members of the Scientific Council of the Foundation (including Arbitrators and Observers) must disclose confidential call information known to them, as well as information about the personal composition of the Commission call and Panels (except when the Scientific Council of the Foundation decided to make such information publicly available) to persons who are not members of the Call Commission or members of the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

3. The organizational form of the work of the Call Commission/Panel is meetings convened by the Chairperson of the Call Commission/Panel or at the initiative of at least three members of the Call Commission/Panel. Meetings of the Call Commission/Panel can be held online using audio and video communication; in this case, an audio/video recording of the meeting is made. The recording is kept until the results of the call are made public by the Scientific Council of the Foundation and is also considered confidential call information. The meeting of the Call Commission/Panel is valid if at least two-thirds of its members took part in it.

4. In the absence of provisions in this Procedure that determine the procedure for holding a meeting or consideration of any of the procedural issues, the Call Commission must make a decision that ensures the objectivity, impartiality and timeliness of the competitive selection and other principles of the competitive selection in accordance with the Procedure. Such a decision must be documented in writing with an indication of the procedure used by the Call Commission.

5. Not later than two working days before the start of the meeting, the secretary of the Call Commission/Panel sends an invitation by e-mail to all members of the Call Commission/Panel.

In the event that no response is received to the invitation, the members of the Call Commission from whom no response was received are notified by phone about the time and place of the meeting of the Call Commission or about the time of the meeting in online mode or audio/video conference.

6. At each meeting of the Call Commission/Panel, minutes are kept indicating the voting results. Members of the Call Commission/Panel may have a special opinion regarding the subject of the vote and have the right to express such opinion by recording it in the minutes. The minutes are signed by the Chairperson and secretary of the Call Commission/Panel. In the case of participation of all or part of the members of the Call Commission/Panel in the meeting in the mode of audio/video conferencing or online voting, the secretary of the Call Commission/Panel certifies the correctness of the data reflected in the minutes regarding the physically absent members of the Call Commission/Panel with his signature in the minutes. A copy of the minutes of each meeting is sent by the secretary to all members of the Call Commission/Panel by e-mail no later than three working days after the end of the meeting. The minutes are considered to be approved by the members of the Call Commission/Panel if they have not commented on them in writing within seven working days from the day of the end of the meeting, sent by e-mail to the Chairperson and secretary of the Call Commission/Panel.

Summarizing the results of the call is carried out at the meeting of the Call Commission. The minutes of the meeting of the Call Commission as of summarizes the results of the call are signed by all members of the Call Commission present at the meeting. In the case of force majeure circumstances, summarizing the results of the call can be carried out by conducting a meeting of the Call Commission in online mode or audio/video conference; in this case, the minutes are signed by the Chairperson and the secretary of the Call Commission, and each member of the Call Commission sends a paper copy of the minutes signed by him/her to the secretary by mail within two days.

All minutes of the Call Commission/Panel meetings, including audio/video recordings of the meetings, are kept by the Directorate of the Foundation in accordance with current legislation, audio/video recordings of the meetings are kept until the mandate of the Call Commission has expired.

7. About all detected cases of possible violation by reviewers or members of the Call Commission of the requirements of the Regulations on compliance with the principles of research ethics and conflicts of interests prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific - technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, the Chairperson of the Call Commission is obliged to notify the Head of the Foundation within no more than three working days from the moment the Call Commission establishes the fact of the violation. The notification is aimed at making decisions by the Scientific Council of the section of the Foundation to prevent these persons from further participation in scientific and scientific-technical reviewing procedures and/ or competitive selection of projects submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine; such decisions are referred to the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

8. The Call Commission/Panel makes decisions by simple majority of its members through open voting, including cases when the Call Commission/Panel decides to exempt its member from the voting due to a conflict of interest or other circumstances affecting his/her impartiality

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the Scientific Council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28).*

In the event that all or part of the members of the Call Commission/Panel participate in the meeting in the mode of audio/video conferencing or online voting, the secretary of the Call Commission/Panel is personally responsible for ensuring the documentary recording of the authenticity of the voting results, by means of video or audio recording, etc.

The secretary of the Call Commission/Panel counts the votes. If according to the results of voting for different proposals, an equal number of votes is received, the Chairperson of the Call Commission/Panel puts the question to a second vote after additional discussion. In case of repeated equal distribution of votes, the vote of the Chairperson of the Call Commission/Panel is decisive.

Voting by proxy or transfer of vote to another member of the Call Commission/Panel is not allowed.

9. According to the results of the consideration of the projects, within five working days after the decision of the Call Commission, minutes are drawn up with an indication of the results of the reviewing expressed in numerical scores and proposals regarding the rating list of the projects and their numerical score.

Attached to the protocol is a list of projects recommended for implementation at the expense of the Foundation's grant support, as well as a list of call winners with an indication of the recommended amount of project financing and their distribution by year within the limits of the Foundation's budget, provided for the respective purposes.

The materials mentioned above are submitted to the Scientific Council of the Foundation for approval of the results of the call.

10. The remuneration of the members of the Call Commission is carried out taking into account the Procedure for the use of funds by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine and the Norms of remuneration of reviewers who are involved in conducting state scientific and scientific and technical reviewing which is carried out at the expense of the state budget.

to the Procedure conducting scientific and scientific - technical reviewing  
of projects and consideration of applications for grant support  
submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine

**Criteria and form of project assessment by the  
National Research Foundation of Ukraine  
(Methodical support for reviewing)**

**I. Criteria and form of assessment of research and development projects**

1. Assessment of projects is carried out by independent reviewers according to the form and criteria approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.
2. Each project is assessed according to the following aspects with corresponding weighting factors:
  - quality of the research planned;
  - significance of the project for further development of science / engineering / technologies / society (according to the thematic direction of the project);
  - quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan;
  - research track record of project implementers.
3. Each of the aspects includes several assessment criteria with their own weighting factors.
4. The assessment for each criterion is carried out by a reviewer with a 5-point scale and obligatory provision of the appropriate justification.
5. The number of points for an aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of points for the evaluation criteria for this aspect.
6. The total number of points of the project is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points by aspects, multiplied by 20.
7. For project assessment, a 5-point scale with the following points value is used for each criterion:

<b>0</b>	The project does not meet the criterion or cannot be evaluated due to the absence or incompleteness of the information provided for by this criterion.
<b>1 – Unsatisfactory</b>	Information as of assessed criterion is inadequately presented or has critical deficiencies.
<b>2 – Satisfactory</b>	In general, the project meets the criterion, but at the same time there are significant shortcomings.
<b>3 – Good</b>	The project meets the criterion, but there are some shortcomings.
<b>4 – Very good</b>	The project meets the criterion very well, but improvement is possible.
<b>5 – Excellent</b>	The indicator fully meets the criterion.

The following criteria, weighting coefficients and form are used to assess the project for the implementation of research and development:

1. Projects are assessed by independent reviewers according to the form and criteria approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.
2. Each project is assessed according to the following aspects with corresponding weighting factors:
  - quality of the research planned;
  - significance of the project for further development of science / engineering / technologies / society (according to the thematic direction of the project);
  - quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan;
  - research track record of project implementers.
3. Each of the aspects includes several assessment criteria with their own weighting factors.
4. The assessment for each criterion is carried out by a reviewer with a 5-point scale and obligatory provision of the appropriate justification.
5. The number of points for an aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of points for the evaluation criteria for this aspect.
6. The total number of points of the project is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points by aspects, multiplied by 20.



7. For project assessment, a 5-point scale with the following points value is used for each criterion:

<b>0</b>	The project does not meet the criterion or cannot be evaluated due to the absence or incompleteness of the information provided for by this criterion.
<b>1 – Unsatisfactory</b>	Information as of assessed criterion is inadequately presented or has critical deficiencies.
<b>2 – Satisfactory</b>	In general, the project meets the criterion, but at the same time there are significant shortcomings.
<b>3 – Good</b>	The project meets the criterion, but there are some shortcomings.
<b>4 – Very good</b>	The project meets the criterion very well, but improvement is possible.
<b>5 – Excellent</b>	The indicator fully meets the criterion.

The following criteria, weighting coefficients and form are used to assess the project for the implementation of research and development:

<b>Evaluation criteria</b>	<b>Rating scale</b>	<b>Weight factor</b>
<p><b>1. Quality of the research planned</b></p> <p>This section provides an assessment of the justification of the scientific project, its focus on the solution of an actual (urgent) scientific problem, the clarity of the formulation of the goal and tasks, the compliance of the project with the modern world level of scientific achievements, the novelty of the scientific idea, the originality of the scientific hypothesis, the correctness of the choice of methodology and research methods for verification of a scientific hypothesis.</p>	<p><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p><b>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean weighted points according to the criteria</b></p>	<p><b>The weight factor of the aspect is determined by the terms and conditions of the call</b></p>

<p><b>1.1.</b> Motivation and validity of the research concept: whether the current state of research and problems that need to be solved are described adequately and with appropriate references.</p>	0-5	0.3
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p><b>1.2.</b> The novelty of the research ideas (including from the standpoint of interdisciplinarity if the research is multidisciplinary in nature).</p>	0-5	0.3
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p><b>1.3.</b> Clarity and relevance of the stated goal and objectives of the research</p>	0-5	0.2
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p><b>1.4.</b> Adequacy of the proposed research approaches and methods, their compliance with the purpose and tasks of the project.</p>	0-5	0.2
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
	<b>Weighted average score</b>	

<p><b>2. Significance of the project for the further development of science / engineering / technology / society (according to the thematic direction of the project)</b></p> <p>Within this section, an assessment of the clarity of the definition and argumentativeness of the prospect of further application of the research results for the purpose of developing science and new technologies, as well as the possibilities of implementing the research results in the economic and social spheres is to be made. The completeness and potential effectiveness of the publication of research results, the possibility of commercialization of the project's achievements are taken into account.</p>	<p><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p><b>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean</b></p> <p><b>weighted points according to the criteria</b></p>	<p><b>The weight factor of the aspect is determined by the terms and conditions of the call</b></p>
<p><b>2.1.</b> The potential importance of the expected results and the acquisition of new knowledge, the development of new approaches and technologies and/or their importance for solving actual practical scientific / technical / social problems.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.5</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p><b>2.2.</b> Effectiveness and appropriateness of planned ways of publicizing/using research results (expected professional publications, patents, presentations at international scientific conferences, dissemination of research results among the public).</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.5</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
	<p><b>Weighted average score</b></p>	

--

<p><b>3. Quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan</b></p> <p>Within this section, the reviewer assesses reasonableness of the work plan and the clarity of intermediate goals, their logical sequence; the clarity of the description of the planned tasks with the indication of specific results that can be verified; consistency of the complexity of the tasks with their time frames; compliance of the equipment and materials specified as necessary for the implementation of the project, the realization of its purpose and tasks; the clarity of the description of equipment and materials and the adequacy of their price in the budget.</p>	<p><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p><b>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean</b></p> <p><b>weighted points according to the criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Aspect weight</b></p> <p><b>- determined by the terms and conditions of the call</b></p>
<p>3.1. The validity of the work plan, the compliance of the time frame with the complexity of the formulated stages and tasks, the clarity of intermediate goals, their logical sequence.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.25</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p>3.2. Compliance of the material and technical base, equipment (available and planned) with the tasks set.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.25</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		
<p>3.3. Balance and reasonableness of the overall project budget.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.25</p>

<i>Comments:</i>		
3.4. Availability and reasonableness of assessment of possible risks and prediction of ways to prevent or resolve them.	0-5	0.25

<i>Comments:</i>		
	<b>Weighted average score</b>	
<b>4. Research track record of project implementers</b>		
	<b>From 0 to 5</b> <b>The number of points for the aspect is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points for the criteria</b>	<b>The weight factor of the aspect is determined by the terms and conditions of the call</b>
4.1. The quality of the PI's publications over the past 5 years.	0-5	0.3
4.2. The quality of the publications of the project's implementers over the past 5 years	0-5	0.3
4.3. The balance of the team of implementers: compliance of the number of implementers with the level of their qualifications with the goals and tasks of the project.	0-5	0.2

4.4. Participation of the project PI and implementers in scientific programs financed by national (home) and international organizations and institutions (in particular, grants) over the past 5 years.	0-5	0.2	
	<b>Weighted average score</b>		
	<b>Total score of the project in: arithmetic mean weighted scores by aspects, multiplied by 20</b>		

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the scientific council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28)*

## **II. Criteria and form of assessment of research and development projects for individual grants**

1. Assessment of projects is carried out by independent reviewers according to the form and criteria approved by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.
2. Each project is assessed according to the following components with corresponding weighting factors:
  - Quality of the research planned;
  - Significance of the project for further development of science / engineering / technologies (according to the thematic direction of the project);
  - Quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan;
3. Each of the aspects includes several assessment criteria that have their own weighting factors.
4. The assessment for each criterion is carried out by a reviewer with a 5-point scale and obligatory provision of the appropriate justification.
5. The number of points for an aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of points for the evaluation criteria for this aspect.

6. The total number of points of the project is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points by aspects, multiplied by 20.

7. A 5-point scale with the following points is used to assess the project:

<b>0</b>	The project does not meet the criterion or cannot be evaluated due to the absence or incompleteness of the information provided for by this criterion.
<b>1 - Unsatisfactory</b>	Information as of assessed criterion is inadequately presented or has critical deficiencies.
<b>2 – Satisfactory</b>	In general, the project meets the criterion, but at the same time there are significant shortcomings.
<b>3 – Good</b>	The project meets the criterion, but there are some shortcomings.
<b>4 – Very good</b>	The project meets the criterion very well, but improvement is possible.
<b>5 – Excellent</b>	The indicator fully meets the criterion.

The following aspects, their weights and form are used to evaluate the project in the call:

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Rating scale</b>	<b>Weight factor</b>

<p><b>1. Quality of the research planned</b></p> <p>This section provides for assessment of the justification of the research project, its focus on the solution of an actual (urgent) scientific problem, the clarity of the formulation of the goal and tasks, the compliance of the project with the modern world level of scientific achievements, the novelty of the research idea, the originality of the scientific hypothesis, the correctness of the choice of methodology and research methods for verification of a scientific hypothesis.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">The number of points for the aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic average of points according to the criteria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p>
<p>1.1. Motivation and validity of the research concept: whether the current state of research and the problems that need to be solved are described adequately and with appropriate references.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0.25</p>
<p>1.2. Relevance and novelty of the research ideas (including from the standpoint of interdisciplinarity if the research is multidisciplinary in nature).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0.25</p>
<p>1.3. Clarity and relevance of the stated goal and objectives of the research.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0.25</p>
<p>1.4. Adequacy of the proposed research approaches and methods, their compliance with the purpose and tasks of the project.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0.25</p>
<p><b>2. Significance of the project for the further development of science/engineering/technologies/society (according to the thematic direction of the project)</b></p> <p>Within this section, an assessment of the clarity of the definition and argumentation of the prospect of further application of the research results for the purpose of developing science and new technologies and solving society's problems is provided. The completeness and potential effectiveness of the publication of research results are taken into account.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">The number of points for the aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic average of points according to the criteria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p>



<p>2.1. The potential importance of the expected results and the acquisition of new knowledge in comparison with the best world achievements in the development of the specified scientific problem, the development of new approaches and technologies and/or their importance for solving actual practical scientific / technical / social problems.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.4</p>
<p>2.2. Effectiveness and appropriateness of planned ways of publicizing/using research results (expected professional publications, patents, presentations at international scientific conferences, dissemination of research results among the public, etc.).</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.3</p>
<p>2.3. The prospect of continuing the research of the specified problem in the future.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.3</p>
<p><b>3. Quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan</b></p> <p>Within this section, the reviewer assessed the reasonableness of the work plan and the clarity of intermediate goals, their logical sequence; the clarity of the description of the planned tasks with the indication of specific results that can be verified; consistency of the complexity of the tasks with their time frames; conformity of the equipment and materials indicated as necessary for the implementation of the project (if necessary to purchase them and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the call); realization of its purpose and tasks; the clarity of the description of the equipment and materials and the adequacy of their price in the budget (if necessary to purchase them and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the call).</p>	<p><b>From 0 to 5</b></p> <p>The number of points for the aspect is calculated as a weighted arithmetic average of points according to the criteria</p>	<p>–</p>
<p>3.1. The validity of the work plan, the methodology of its implementation, compliance with the time frames of the complexity of the formulated stages and tasks, the clarity of intermediate goals, their logical sequence.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.3</p>
<p>3.2. Consistency of the complexity of the tasks with their time frames, as well as the balance and reasonableness of the overall project budget.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.2</p>

3.3. Clarity of construction of the logical and structural research scheme.	0-5	0.2
3.4. The quality of the PI's publications over the past 5 years.	0-5	0.3

*(as amended in accordance with the decision of the scientific council of the NRFU dated 10/26/2023, minutes No. 28)*