

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

of the Call for Proposals on Research Projects of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine

“Excellent Fundamental Science in Ukraine 2027-2029”

(hereinafter – the Terms)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

1.1. Title of the Call for Proposals: “Excellent Fundamental Science in Ukraine 2027-2029” (hereinafter – the Call).

1.2. The purpose of the Call is to select projects for a collective grant support for excellent fundamental research (hereinafter – Project/Projects) that involves the formulation and solution of urgent scientific issues by a group of leading and early-career researchers to ensure Ukraine's competitiveness in the world, promote the developments of the national research potential and its integration into the global research area.

The competitive selection is carried out in accordance with the Procedure for 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 27 December 2019, No. 1170.

1.3. Thematic areas of the Call

The thematic areas of the projects shall correspond to the priority area defined solely by paragraph 2 of Article 3 of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Priority Areas of Science and Technology Development’ <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2623-14#Text> (fundamental research on the most important issues of development of scientific and technical, social and economic, social and political, human potential to ensure Ukraine's competitiveness in the world and sustainable development of society and the state).

Project Eligibility Criteria with the Thematic Areas of the Call:

- 1) The Project shall be aimed at generating fundamental knowledge, rather than an applied product;
- 2) The expected outcomes of the Project include hypotheses, theories, new

methods of inquiry, discoveries of natural laws, previously unknown phenomena and properties of matter, identification of patterns in societal development, etc., which are not intended for immediate practical application in the economic sphere.

Applications for grant support (hereinafter – the Application) that contain information classified as a state secret (in accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On State Secrets”) **shall not be accepted for consideration under the Call.**

The absence of state-secret information in the Application **shall** be explicitly confirmed in a guarantee letter from the legal entity submitting the Application, signed by its head.

The head of the legal entity participating in the Call shall bear full responsibility for the presence of any state-secret information in the Application materials.

1.4. Duration of the projects to be selected based on the results of the Call:

The projects are expected to be implemented in 2027-2029 **in three intermediate stages** of Project implementation (provided that the corresponding budget allocations of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (hereinafter – the Foundation, NRFU, or the Grantor) are available for the respective year):

- the first stage of Project implementation (tentatively 9 months, March-November 2027);
- the second stage (tentatively 9 months, March-November 2028);
- the third stage (tentatively 9 months, March-November 2029).

Planning the duration of the Project implementation stages shall be guided by the deadlines for processing the reporting documentation provided by the grantee to confirm the completion of each stage of the Project (no less than 14 calendar days from the date of completion of the respective intermediate stage of Project implementation). By the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the duration of the Project implementation stages planned in the Application may be adjusted at the time of the Grant Agreement conclusion (hereinafter – the Agreement), taking into account and in accordance with budget revenues of the Foundation in the respective year).

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS FOR THE CALL, PI, AUTHORS AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS*

[*The requirements are formulated in accordance with the Agreement on](#)

Reforming Research Assessment

2.1. General requirements.

The applicant, on whose behalf the PI of the Project submits the Application, may be institutions of higher education (as defined by the Law of Ukraine ‘On Higher Education’) of any organizational and legal form and form of ownership, as well as research institutions (as defined by the Law of Ukraine ‘On Scientific and Scientific and Technical Activities’) of any organizational and legal form and of state or communal ownership. Such legal entities may participate in the Call if they are duly registered in Ukraine in accordance with the legislation, meet the Terms of this Call, express their willingness to participate in the Call, authorize the Project’s PI to submit the Application and the documents required for participation in the Call, guarantee the conduct at their facilities of the research envisaged by the Project, and undertake to conclude a grant agreement.

Legal entities whose founders, beneficial owners and participants are citizens of the aggressor state and the republic of belarus, as well as legal entities operating in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, **may not** participate in the Call. The restriction on entry into this Call also applies to individuals and legal entities subject to restrictive measures (sanctions) imposed by the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine.

The Terms of the Call do not provide for the involvement of a partner(s) in the preparation of the Application and Project implementation.

Groups of project authors (a PI and at least two other authors) are eligible to submit Applications. The PI and at least one author shall have a research degree obtained or recognized in Ukraine. Other authors of the Project shall have a research degree, except for PhD candidates of any age and early-career researchers who have completed higher education at least at the second (Master’s) level.

All Project authors shall have research publications in a sphere related to the thematic area of the Project (at the same time, conference abstracts may be counted only for early-career researchers).

If the group consists of three authors (including the PI), at least one of them shall be an early-career researcher as of the date of the submission of the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’. If the group consists of four or more authors (including the PI), at least two of them shall be early-career researchers as of the date of the submission of the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’.

Note: an early-career researcher is a researcher under the age of 35 years old, inclusive, who has a higher education degree of at least the second (Master's) level, or a researcher under the age of 40 years old, inclusive, who has a doctoral degree (age at the date of the submission of the Application via the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects').

The Project's PI shall be employed **at the main place of employment** at the legal entity participating in the Call, on behalf of which the Application is submitted. Other Project authors may work or study in postgraduate programs at the same or at different institutions (organizations, enterprises). Auxiliary personnel, including (but not limited to) higher education students, may be involved in the Project group. Auxiliary personnel do not need to be individually identified at the date of the Application submission.

One individual cannot be represented in more than one Application submitted to this Call. The PI and authors may be implementers of another successful project of another call for proposals of the Foundation, the funding of which is ongoing or has not started due to the incomplete procedure for concluding an agreement with the grantee. At the same time, the PI cannot be presented in the Application for this Call if he/she is already the PI of a project that was successful in another call for proposals of the Foundation, the funding of which is ongoing or has not been started due to the incomplete procedure for concluding an agreement with the grantee (at the same time, the Call does not impose any restrictions on participation as a Project PI for individuals who are the first or sole authors of research works that have been awarded the Award of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine for Early-Career Researchers).

A Project PI may not be an individual who is already designated as a PI in an application submitted to another call for proposals of the Foundation for which the competitive selection has not yet been completed (with the exception of competitive selections for obtaining Grants of the President of Ukraine and the Award of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine named after Ihor Yukhnovskiy).

A Project PI may not be an individual who serves as the head of a legal entity (Call applicant) on behalf of which the Application is submitted.

The PI and project author may not be employees of the Foundation's Directorate, members of the Scientific Council of the Foundation and Supervisory Board.

Individuals who are PIs or authors of Projects submitted for participation in the Call may not be involved in organizing or conducting the scientific and technical reviewing of Projects under this Call as members of the Call

Commission or as reviewers.

Persons against whom the Scientific Council of the Foundation has applied restrictive measures/enforcement measures limiting participation in the Foundation's calls for proposals are not entitled to participate in the Call.

The Project PI and the Call applicant are responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in the Application and the documents attached thereto.

The detection of false information in the documents submitted by the Call applicant is grounds for the withdrawal of the Application from consideration at any stage of the competitive selection.

When submitting an Application for the Call and implementing the project, the project authors (implementers) shall follow the [The Regulations on Compliance with the Principles of Research Ethics and Conflict 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](#) including requirements regarding the prohibition of cooperation with representatives of the aggressor state and temporarily occupied territories.

Submission of Applications by researchers (PI and other Project authors) who, as of the date of submission, have had scientific cooperation with representatives of the aggressor state, temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, or individuals officially associated with them after February 24, 2022, as well as with legal entities established by the occupation authorities in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including individuals officially associated with them after March 18, 2014, is prohibited.

Violation of these requirements shall be grounds for rejection of the Application for the entire competitive selection period.

Important!

Project authors submitting Applications, whose activities show formal signs of cooperation with representatives of the aggressor state or the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, have the right to provide corresponding explanations and evidence of the absence of actual cooperation, together with the Application, for further review and decision by the Call Commission. Such explanations and evidence may be uploaded as a separate file (or files) in PDF format when submitting the Application in the "Documents" section.

2.2. The PI of a Project in Mathematical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural and Medical Sciences may be a researcher who has a research degree obtained or recognized in Ukraine by a decision of competent state authority, works **at the main place of employment** in a legal entity submitting the Application for participation in the Call, and meets the first criterion and at least two other criteria defined in the Project PI questionnaire. PIs who belong to the category of early-career researchers (as of the date of the submission of the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’) shall have a research degree obtained or recognized in Ukraine by a decision of competent state authority, work **at their main place of employment** in a legal entity submitting the Application for participation in the Call, and meets only the first criterion in the Project PI Questionnaire.

Note: the information as provided for in Clause 2.2 of the Terms shall be clearly stated in the Application and in the attached documents (uploaded in separate files and to be assessed by reviewers):

- CV according to the approved form (in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#));
- a questionnaire of the Project PI according to the approved form (Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences) in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#).

The PI of a Project in Social Sciences and Humanities may be a researcher who has a research degree obtained or recognised in Ukraine by a decision of competent state authority, works **at the main place of employment** in a legal entity submitting the Application for participation in the Call, and meets the first criterion and at least two other criteria specified in the questionnaire of the Project PI.

Note: the information as provided for in Clause 2.2 of the Terms shall be clearly stated in the Application and in the attached documents (uploaded in separate files and to be assessed by reviewers):

- CV according to the approved form (in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#));
- a questionnaire of the Project PI according to the approved form (Social Sciences and Humanities) in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#).

2.3. Implementation of the project

The grantee is responsible for the continuous implementation of the Project tasks within each interim stage of its implementation and for the full completion of the Project.

Project implementers may not be affiliated to a foreign institution.

The PI and other Project implementers shall implement the Project on the territory of Ukraine exclusively at the facilities of the legal entity that is the winner of the Call (the grantee).

During the implementation of the Project, the PI or project implementers may stay abroad for no more than 3 months in total per interim stage of the Project implementation. The grantee is responsible for ensuring compliance with this requirement, as well as for the continuous implementation of the Project tasks in accordance with the Calendar Plan for implementation of scientific research (and developments) (hereinafter – Calendar Plan).

In cases where, while staying abroad, the PI and/or other Project implementers receive monetary reward (remuneration) from sources other than the Ukrainian legal entity where they are employed and/or from the Foundation's grant funds, they may not simultaneously receive remuneration from the Foundation's grant funds. In such cases, the grantee shall notify the Foundation by an official letter about the terms and conditions of such reward (remuneration). The responsibility for complying with this requirement, as well as for ensuring the continuous implementation of the Project tasks in accordance with the Calendar Plan, shall be ensured by the grantee.

A project submitted for participation in this Call cannot be simultaneously submitted for participation in another call for proposals for the purpose of obtaining funding. Nor may a project be submitted for participation in this Call that is or has been funded from any other source.

The fact of the Project's funding by the NRFU, as well as the Project number and title, shall be indicated in all publications, official announcements, media materials, social media posts, other publicly available sources, and during presentations at research events aimed at disseminating the research results. Publications, announcements, or other materials that do not include this information will not be taken into account by the Scientific Council of the Foundation when reviewing the reporting documents on the Project's outcomes. If there are publications referencing funding from multiple sources, the reporting documents shall specify which results were achieved with the support of the NRFU grant.

Grantees shall take all available measures to promote the Project to the general public and the results obtained during its implementation.

The Scientific Council of the Foundation considers scientific pseudo-conferences (including congresses, symposia, workshops, etc.) and respective publications

(conference proceedings, abstracts, etc.) to be unacceptable forms of approbation of the results of the research work of project implementers if their organizers/publishers are commercial non-academic structures whose main activity is to implement such events and publications on a paid basis and in absentia. Such events and publications only imitate research events and publications and are a profanation of scientific platforms for substantive professional scientific discussion, they discredit researchers and projects supported by the Foundation. Therefore, the Scientific Council of the Foundation does not allow their inclusion in research reports on project implementation and will not take into account such conferences/publications as indicators of the implementation of the Terms of Reference and Calendar Plan. The Scientific Council of the Foundation invites project implementers to present the results of scientific work within the project at events and in publications organized by institutions of higher education, research institutions, and specialized professional associations of researchers (in a respective research area).

When planning the Project, it is recommended to define how the Project will align with open science practices. This includes open access to publications and FAIR data. In addition, it is advisable to consider how open science practices will be integrated into the Project's methodology and workflow.

The Project should include a set of actions and strategies aimed at disseminating information about its progress and results in order to maximize its impact on individuals, organizations, and communities, including activities for promoting the outcomes achieved. Dissemination of information on the Project's progress and results is an integral part of the Project and should be carried out throughout its duration, as well as after its completion. Each stage of the Project should include communication activities related to the specific stage of the research, specifying the structure and content of messages to be conveyed, the target audiences who will benefit most, and the most effective channels for their dissemination.

2.4. Requirements for the results of interim stages of project implementation and the final result of the Project

The Application and Terms of Reference (see clauses 4.1 of the ToR) shall contain clear and **realistic** quantitative and qualitative indicators of the implementation of the project's goals and objectives, in particular – the number and format of planned research publications, specific characteristics/parameters of other research products that will be the result of research activities for each stage of project implementation and at its conclusion.

The indicators of the **quality** of the completed project (specified in clause 4.1 of

the ToR) should be research publications of the highest level of research results, namely: for **Natural, Technical, Mathematical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences** – articles in international professional publications that belong to Q1-Q2 according to the Scimago Journal & Country Rank classification; for **Social Sciences and Humanities** – articles published in professional periodicals that are indexed in international scientometric databases and in categories A, B publications in Ukraine, or publications Q1-Q4, collective monographs, research publications in book format, as well as electronic research resources/products (electronic databases, e-archives, e-catalogs, e-libraries, e-depositories, etc.).

Expected results should also include hypotheses, theories, new methods of knowledge, discoveries of laws of nature, previously unknown phenomena or properties of matter, as well as the identification of patterns in the development of society, etc.

The justification for research novelty (innovation) shall be set out in clause 3.3 of the ToR and should contain a thorough comparison of the proposed research and its expected project results with analogues existing in world science.

The Terms of Reference (see clause 4.2) shall outline the short-term, medium-term, and long-term impact of the proposed research on the development of the respective research area. It should be justified how the expected results will contribute to the formation, developments, and strengthening of current trends in the respective field of knowledge, for example, through the creation of theoretical models, concepts, databases, or tools for analysis.

The Terms of Reference shall contain a clear description of the fundamental nature of the research (see Clause 3.3 of the ToR), identification of the field of potential application of the results, and outline of the circle of potential stakeholders (see clause 4.3 of the Terms of References – ToR). If applicable, the expected socio-economic, cultural-educational, or environmental impact of the potential application of the Project results is indicated.

The Terms of Reference (see clause 4.1 and 5.1 of the ToR) shall indicate the methods of testing the research results and the ways of disseminating information about the Project results (for example, presentations at conferences, public events, social networks, cooperation with the media), indicating the number of such dissemination events and the approximate number of applicants.

Property rights of intellectual property created during the implementation of the Project at the expense of grant support of the NRFU shall belong to the grantee,

except for the cases provided for by Part Two of Article 11 of the Law of Ukraine “On State Regulation of Activity in the Sphere of Transfer of Technologies”.

2.5. General ethical aspects of conducting research

When preparing the Application, the applicant shall take into account the standards and ethical norms respective to the specific scientific field, including those established by international regulations. The Terms of Reference for the Project shall clearly define the ethical considerations of conducting the research, providing information on how the most significant ethical issues will be addressed during the Project implementation. Responsibility for compliance with research ethics standards shall be ensured by the authors (implementers) of the Project and the legal entities participating in the Call (grantees). The work of the Call Commission and the scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of Projects do not include the assessment of general ethical aspects of the planned research under the Projects submitted to the Call.

When providing information on addressing the most significant ethical issues during the implementation of the Project, the following aspects, among others, should be taken into account:

- **Ensuring gender equality**

When forming the group of Project authors, gender discrimination shall be avoided and equal opportunities for involvement in the Project should be ensured for researchers regardless of their gender.

- **Compliance with standards and ethical norms respective to the specific scientific field (if applicable)**

If the Project involves work with objects requiring specific ethical regulation, the Call applicant shall ensure compliance with ethical standards, including the principles of humanity, voluntary participation, informed consent, protection of confidential information, as well as the minimization of potential ethical risks and the responsible use of research results.

- **Conducting research taking into account environmental safety (where applicable)**

When planning and conducting research, it is necessary to foresee and take all possible measures to prevent harm to the environment and to make efforts for the rational use of natural resources and to reduce CO₂ emissions.

- Responsible use of artificial intelligence tools (where applicable)

If artificial intelligence (AI) tools are used within the Project, the authors (implementers) shall ensure that they are applied in a manner consistent with high ethical standards and the principles of safe, transparent, and non-discriminatory operation of algorithmic systems. In such cases, the Application and the reporting documents shall indicate:

- the purpose and areas of AI application within the Project;
- risk management measures related to the protection of personal and sensitive data, potential algorithmic biases and prevention of discrimination, accuracy, reproducibility, and technical reliability of results, transparency of the tools used and the possibility of human verification; compliance with copyright and intellectual property rights;
- AI consultations among the list of used information resources, specifying its contribution.

The use of AI does not relieve researchers of responsibility for the content and interpretation of results. All conclusions obtained with AI involvement shall be verified, assessed, and confirmed by the Project implementers.

2.6. Reporting

The Foundation ensures control over the execution of the Agreements. In case of a breach of the Agreement's terms and conditions, enforcement measures may be applied to the grantee in accordance with the legislation, based on the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

In the event of a significant change in circumstances that may lead to non-fulfillment of the terms of the Agreement, in order to ensure the implementation of the Project, such Agreement may be amended until the completion of the interim stage of the Project defined in the Agreement in terms of the necessary terms and conditions for its implementation within the approved budget. The decision to amend the necessary terms and conditions for Project implementation is made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation at the initiative of the Grantee. The Grantee submits proposals to the Foundation regarding amendments to the Agreement, including justification and supporting documents. The Foundation reviews the proposals and provides the Grantee with a response containing the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation no later than 20 working days from the date of receipt of the proposals. In the event of a positive decision by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, an additional

agreement to the Agreement is concluded regarding the amendment of the Project implementation terms and conditions.

After the completion of each interim stage (except the final one) of the Project implementation, as defined in the Agreement, the grantee shall submit to the Foundation both electronically and in a single hard copy the following documents, in the structure and format approved by the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation: a report on the interim results of the Project, a financial report on the use of budgetary funds, as well as other documents stipulated in the Agreement. These documents constitute the prerequisite for making a decision on the continuation or termination of the Project's grant support. Such a decision is made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation in accordance with the procedure established by law, based on the results of the review of the grantee's reports.

Approval of the documents specified in the preceding paragraph of these Terms shall serve as the basis for signing the Certificate of Completion of the interim stage of the Project implementation.

The grounds for making a decision to terminate the Project's grant support may include:

- a justified conclusion of the Scientific Council of the respective Section of the Foundation regarding a breach of material terms of the Agreement;
- a justified conclusion of the Scientific Council of the respective Section of the Foundation regarding the grantee's inability to implement the Project;
- a justified conclusion of the Scientific Council of the respective Section of the Foundation regarding the loss of relevance of the expected Project results due to scientific, technological, or economic reasons;
- a decision of the Scientific Council of the respective Section of the Foundation concerning the misuse of funds by the grantee, adopted on the basis of a corresponding notification from the state financial control authority following the results of financial control measures conducted at the grantee.

In the event that the Foundation identifies a breach by the Grantee of the essential terms of the Agreement, the Scientific Council of the Foundation shall make a decision to terminate the grant support and require the Grantee to return the full amount of the grant, specifying the deadline for repayment in accordance with the Terms set in the Agreement.

If a state financial control authority establishes the fact of misuse of funds by the Grantee in the course of Project implementation, the amount of funds used for purposes other than intended shall be returned to the Foundation in accordance with the procedure established by law.

In the event of termination of grant support by decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation, a report on the interim results of the project implementation and a financial report on the use of budget funds within the stage are posted on the official website of the Foundation within **five working days** after approval of the reporting documentation by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

If the Grantee refuses to conclude the Agreement for the second and/or third interim stage of the Project implementation, the Foundation shall apply restrictive measures to the Grantee, including with regard to the further participation of such Grantee/the Project's PI/Project implementers in the Foundation's calls for proposals.

After the completion of the Project, the Grantee shall submit to the Foundation, in electronic form and in one hard copy, the following documents in the structure and format approved by the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation: a final report on the Project implementation describing the scientific results obtained, a financial report on the use of budgetary funds (for the respective stage), a report on the use of budgetary funds within the framework of the Project implementation, as well as other documents provided for in the Agreement.

Approval of the documents specified in the preceding paragraph of these Terms shall serve as the basis for signing the Certificate of Completion of the interim (final) stage of the Project implementation.

Within the framework of monitoring the Grantee's compliance with the obligations set in the Agreement, the Foundation analyzes reports on the results of Project implementation and the use of budgetary funds within the Project. The Foundation shall also ensure the publication, within **five working days**, on its official website, of information on the Project results together with the final report on its implementation, including references to published research works and the report on the use of budgetary funds within the Project. Such information shall be made publicly available as open data in accordance with the Law of Ukraine "On Access to Public Information".

In the event of violations of the Agreement, other than breaches of its essential terms, the Grantee and/or Project implementers may be subject to enforcement measures in accordance with the legislation, as decided by the Scientific Council of

the Foundation.

The authors of the Project are personally responsible for the results of its implementation. If it is found that the declared research result does not correspond to the obtained one, the authors of the project may be deprived of participation in the calls for proposals of the Foundation for a period determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

The Grantee and the Legal entity shall complete the state registration procedure of the research activity under the Project no later than the deadlines established by the legislation of Ukraine.

Based on the assessment of the quality of Projects implementation and the publication (disclosure) of its results, or in the event of detection of research cooperation by the Project authors (implementers) with representatives of the aggressor state or temporarily occupied territories, restrictive measures/enforcement measures may be applied to the Projects authors and/or implementers by decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

III. TERMS, TIME AND VENUE OF THE CALL

The terms and conditions of the competitive selection are specified in all clauses of this document which are mandatory.

The Call is to be held **from 25.03.2026 to 15.12.2026** (tentative)

Venue: Borysa Hrinchenka Street, 1, Kyiv, Ukraine.

IV. PROCEDURE FOR ACCEPTANCE (RECEIPT), REGISTRATION AND PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

Application and documents for participation in the Call are submitted by an authorised PI of the Project in Ukrainian and English in electronic form on the official website of the NRFU (<https://grants.nrfu.org.ua>) (only via the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects').

To submit an Application the PI shall complete pre-registration in the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects' on the official website of the NRFU.

Applications for participation in the Call shall be submitted using the form established by the Foundation. Together with the Application, the Project's PI shall submit the documents listed in Clause 6.1 of the Terms.

No replacement or clarifications to the submitted Applications by Call

applicants after the submission deadline is allowed, except for the case specified in Clause 19 of the Procedure for the Competitive Selection and Financing Research and Developments Projects by the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, approved by Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated 27 December 2019, No. 1170.

Registration of Applications for participation in the Call is performed automatically in the NRFU through the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects').

An Application is considered submitted if it is received through the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects' and signed with a qualified electronic signature (QES).

It is recommended that the completed Application for grant support be submitted at least 48 hours before the deadline for submitting the Applications. This will help applicants avoid technical issues when submitting the Applications.

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 section of the Foundation elects at its meeting by open voting the Call Commission from among recognized researchers in the field (with their consent).

Members of the Call Commission may not include members of the Foundation's management bodies, as well as authors of projects submitted for participation in the Call.

The Call Commission shall carry out its activities in accordance with the Regulations on Compliance with the Principles of Research Ethics and Conflict of Interest Prevention during competitive selections, scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine under the grant support programmes of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine.

The Directorate of the Foundation, within the framework of providing organizational support for conducting and organizing calls by the Foundation, on the next working day after the date of the end of the application submission period, starts checking applications for compliance with formal requirements.

This check is carried out in two stages: preliminary and final. The preliminary check is carried out within **10 working days** from the deadline for application submission.

If the preliminary check reveals that the documents submitted by the Applicant do not contain the information required in the Terms, the Directorate of the Foundation notifies the applicant by electronic means of communication of the need to submit the clarified information within **three working days** from the date of notification.

After the deadline for submitting the updated information, the Directorate of the Foundation, **within 10 working days**, conducts a final check of the documents submitted by the Applicant for compliance with the formal requirements taking into account this information.

Grounds for rejection of the Application due to non-compliance with formal requirements:

- non-compliance of the Application submitted by the Call applicant with the form provided for in the Terms;
- absence of documents required by the Terms;
- absence or incomplete provision of information in the documents submitted by the Applicant required by the Terms;
- inconsistency of the information provided in the Application with the requirements set forth in the Terms, including the requirement that project authors (in accordance with clause 2.1 of the Terms) hold a research degree obtained or recognized in Ukraine, requirements regarding the age of early-career researchers who are authors of the Application, as well as requirements for legal entities eligible to participate in the Call;
- the Project PI or other project author is included in more than one Application submitted to this Call (in such case, the Application submitted later shall be rejected);
- the Project PI is already a PI of a successful project in another call for proposals of the Foundation, the funding of which is ongoing or has not started due to the pending procedure of concluding a grant agreement with a grantee;
- the Project PI is already indicated as a PI in an application submitted to another call for proposals of the Foundation for which the competitive

selection has not yet been completed (with the exception of competitive selections for obtaining Grants of the President of Ukraine and the Award of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine named after Ihor Yukhnovskyy);

- the Project PI and/or other project authors are implementers of more than one successful project in another call for proposals of the Foundation, the funding of which is ongoing or has not started due to the pending procedure of concluding a grant agreement with a grantee;
- execution of documents submitted for participation in the Call in non-compliance with the procedure or form established by the Call or the requirements for execution of documents established by law;
- exceeding the maximum amount of funding specified in the Terms for one project as a whole and for each stage separately;
- exceeding the maximum level of the ratio of indirect costs to direct costs for the Project as a whole and for each stage separately above the permissible maximum rate established by the Terms (15% of direct costs);
- exceeding the planned level of remuneration of project implementers and auxiliary personnel above the recommended maximum monthly remuneration established in the [*Methodological Recommendations for planning the budgeted cost of a Project*](#);
- exceeding the planned level of the ratio of remuneration of personnel (including staff of research and organizational, financial, legal, HR services, procurement departments, etc. involved in servicing the Agreement) to direct costs for the Project as a whole and for each stage separately above the permissible maximum rate established by these Terms (5% of direct costs);
- absence or non-compliance with the form of the feasibility study (technical and economic justification) of the need to purchase the equipment (facilities) established by these Terms;
- inconsistency between the absolute cost values provided in commercial offers (for equipment/facilities units exceeding UAH 200,000) and the specifications of the corresponding cost items within the scope of financing

by cost item, along with their economic justification;

- exceeding the planned amount of the “Equipment and facilities ” cost item beyond the maximum level established by these Terms;
- absence or non-compliance with the form and content established by these Terms, the scope of financing by cost item with their economic justification, as well as inconsistencies in cost values between this document and the Application profile (section “Funding”);
- planning of project activities beyond the project duration provided for in the Terms (clause 1.4 of the Terms);
- violation of the requirements regarding restrictions on participation in this Call of individuals and legal entities subject to restrictive measures (sanctions) of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine;
- existence of valid restrictive measures/enforcement measures regarding participation in NRFU Calls applied by the Scientific Council of the Foundation to the Project PI and/or other project authors.

The Directorate of the NRFU informs the respective applicant about the rejection of the Application on formal requirements in electronic form within **three working days** after the deadline for checking applications for compliance with formal requirements.

Criteria for the preliminary review of Projects (including compliance with the purpose, thematic areas and the Terms). Within **10 working days** from the date of completion of the Directorate’s final eligibility check of applications for compliance with formal requirements, conducts their **preliminary review regarding compliance with the Terms, in particular**, the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, detection of false information in the documents submitted by the applicant.

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 false 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.

Grounds for withdrawal of applications from consideration during the preliminary review:

- inconsistency of the submitted project with the purpose, thematic areas or the Terms (justification for such compliance is to be provided in the text of the Application and the Terms of Reference), including the requirement specified in paragraph one of clause 1.3 of the Terms;
- the applicant provided false information;
- inconsistency of the submitted project with the Regulations on compliance with the principles of scientific ethics and prevention of conflicts of interest during competitive selection, scientific and scientific and technical expertise of projects and consideration of applications for grant support submitted to the National Research Foundation of Ukraine in the areas of grant support of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine;
- the qualification level of the Project PI and other project authors does not meet the criteria set out in the Terms (see Section II of the Terms).

The identification of false or misleading information in the documents submitted by a Call applicant shall constitute grounds for the removal of the Application from consideration at any stage of the competitive selection.

Based on the results of the preliminary review of applications for compliance with the Terms, in particular the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, in the event that false information is found 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 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 Terms, in particular the criteria by which projects are selected, determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the discovery of false information in the documents submitted by the Applicant.

If the Application complies with the Terms, the Call Commission shall submit the Project to experts for scientific and scientific and technical reviewing within the time limits established by [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](#).

The Call Commission organizes and performs its work in three panels:

- Panel of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Mathematics;
- Panel of Biology, Medicine and Agricultural Sciences;
- Panel of Social Sciences and Humanities.

V. DEADLINES FOR SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS, SCIENTIFIC AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEWING OF PROJECTS AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE RESULTS OF THE CALL

Date and time of the start of application submission: 25.03.2026, 00:01 Kyiv time.

Date and time of application submission deadline: 24.04.2026, 23:59 Kyiv time.

Period for conducting scientific and scientific and technical reviewing and announcement of the results of the Call: until 15.12.2026 (tentatively).

The decisions regarding the rejection of a submitted Application due to non-compliance with formal requirements, the approval of the list of Applications withdrawn from consideration, and the formation of the ranking list and the list of successful projects of the competitive selection shall not be subject to review by the Foundation.

Information on the results of the Call shall be posted on the official website of the Foundation and shall include:

- 1) the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation on approval of the results of the Call;
- 2) the amount of funding for projects recommended for implementation with the grant support from the Foundation;
- 3) the ranking list of projects with the points scored by each project.

In determining the scores obtained by each Project, the results shall be rounded to one decimal place. The cut-off point of the list of Projects recommended for

implementation with the grant support from the Foundation shall be determined in direct relation to the ranking list of Projects, the total amount of funding allocated for Projects under the Terms, the number of Projects submitted to the Call, and their respective funding amounts. When compiling the list of Projects recommended for implementation with the grant support from the Foundation, the Call Commission shall apply the following criteria to determine the cut-off point of the list in cases where several Projects receive an equal number of points:

- Projects whose PIs are women shall be placed higher in the list;
- where both the score and gender criteria are identical, Projects shall be ranked according to the age of their PIs, from younger (higher in the list) to older (lower in the list).

The PI is sent a textual justification of the scores received by the project based on the results of the scientific and scientific and technical reviewing by email.

IX. DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE CALL AND UPON SIGNING THE CONTRACT

Documents for participation in the Call shall be submitted in Ukrainian and in English in electronic form on the website of the NRFU (<https://grants.nrfu.org.ua>) (through the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’).

The documents submitted for participation in the Call in the approved form shall be executed in strict compliance with the form and content of the relevant document.

6.1. Documents to be submitted by the applicant together with the Application (in the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’):

1. Consent of the Project authors to its implementation (a mark in the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’ using a qualified electronic signature through the Project author's personal account).
2. A Letter of Guarantee from the Call applicant on whose behalf the Application is submitted, [in the form approved by the Foundation](#), confirming the commitment to ensure the conduct of the scientific research envisaged by the Project on the premises of this legal entity. The Letter of Guarantee (scanned copy) shall be submitted in Ukrainian and signed by the head of the legal entity or a person acting in that capacity.
3. Certificate (scanned copy in Ukrainian) from the place of work of the PI with a

mandatory indication that the PI works **at the main place of work** in the legal entity on whose behalf the Application is submitted. NOTE: the certificate must contain the phrase 'AT THE MAIN PLACE OF WORK' ([sample form of the certificate](#)).

4. CV of the PI and other authors of the Project, in the approved form (electronic copy, in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#)). All links provided in the document must be active.

5. Questionnaire of the PI, in the approved form, in Ukrainian ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Mathematical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural and Medical Sciences](#)) and English ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Mathematical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural and Medical Sciences](#)). All links provided in the document must be active.

6. A feasibility and economic justification for the purchase of equipment and facilities, signed by the head of the legal entity on whose behalf the Application is submitted, the head of the financial unit of that legal entity, and the PI (if the project involves the purchase of equipment and facilities worth more than UAH 200 thousand per unit), prepared in accordance with the approved form (scanned copy, in Ukrainian ([template](#))).

7. Terms of Reference for the research, in the approved form (scanned copies in Ukrainian ([sample](#)) and English ([sample](#))).

8. Calendar Plan, in the approved form (scanned copies, in Ukrainian ([sample](#)) and English ([sample](#))).

9. Volume of funding by cost items with their economic justification, in the approved form (scanned copies, in Ukrainian ([sample](#)) and English ([sample](#))).

10. Explanations and evidence regarding the absence of collaboration with representatives of the aggressor state (if necessary) (scanned copy, in Ukrainian, personally signed by the Project author).

6.2. Documents that the winner of the Call submits to the NRFU in paper form (originals certified by signatures and seals):

** At the time of concluding Agreements with the winners of the Call, the current versions of the documents shall be submitted to the Foundation in hard copy (originals certified by signatures and seals). The information contained in these documents must correspond to the information in the documents submitted together with the Application.*

1. Grant Agreement with Annexes, in the approved form.
2. A Letter of Guarantee from the winner of the Call on whose behalf the Application was submitted, [in the form approved by the Foundation](#), confirming the commitment to ensure the conduct of the scientific research envisaged by the Project on the premises of this legal entity. The Letter of Guarantee (scanned copy) shall be submitted in Ukrainian and signed by the head of the legal entity or a person acting in that capacity.
3. Certificate from the place of work of the PI with a mandatory indication that the PI works **at the main place of work** in the legal entity on whose behalf the Application is submitted. NOTE: the certificate must contain the phrase 'AT THE MAIN PLACE OF WORK' ([sample form of the certificate](#)).
4. CV of the PI and other authors of the Project, in the approved form (electronic copy, in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#)).
5. Questionnaire of the PI, in the approved form, in Ukrainian ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Mathematical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural and Medical Sciences](#)) and English ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Mathematical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural and Medical Sciences](#)).
6. Informed consent forms from the [PI](#), [Project authors](#), and [other Project personnel](#) (auxiliary personnel) (in the approved form, in Ukrainian).
7. Consent of the implementers of the Project to its implementation (in Ukrainian)
8. Declaration in which the head of the legal entity which is the winner of the Call and on whose behalf the Application was submitted, and the PI confirm that the Project will be implemented on the basis of this legal entity in full, in accordance with the Application; that the legal entity possesses the material and technical base, as well as organizational and human resources necessary to ensure the full implementation of the Project and the proper performance of the Agreement; that the materials, equipment, and instruments purchased using the grant funds will be used for their intended purpose (for the implementation of the Project tasks and the full execution of the Project); and that the grant funds provided by the Foundation will be used for their intended purpose in compliance with the principles established by the budget legislation of Ukraine, in Ukrainian, according to the approved form ([template](#)).

VII. TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDING FOR PROJECTS TO BE SELECTED BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE CALL

The total amount of funding for the Call is up to UAH 800 mln (provided appropriate budgetary allocations are available).

The total amount of funding for the Call in 2027 makes up to UAH 300 mln, in 2028 – up to UAH 250 mln, in 2029 – up to UAH 250 mln (in accordance with budget allocations, taking into account decisions of the Scientific Council of the Foundation).

Important: When completing the “Funding” section of the application, the planned funding amounts for each stage of the Project and for the Project as a whole must be stated in **UAH (Ukrainian hryvnias)**, without decimals or hundredths. No spaces are allowed between the digits (**format: 3350000**).

In cases where, within the framework of the Project:

- the procurement of scientific equipment/facilities with a total value of not less than UAH 200 thousand is envisaged – the maximum funding for a single Project shall be up to UAH 8 mln, of which up to UAH 3.4 mln for the first stage of Project implementation and up to UAH 2.3 mln for each of the second and third stages of Project implementation;
- no procurement of scientific equipment/facilities is envisaged, or its total value is less than UAH 200 thousand – the maximum funding for a single Project shall be up to UAH 7 mln, of which up to UAH 2.4 mln for the first stage of Project implementation and up to UAH 2.3 mln for each of the second and third stages of Project implementation.

The planning of the procurement of scientific equipment/facilities is permitted exclusively during the first stage of Project implementation, and its value may amount to up to UAH 2 mln.

The reallocation of funds between the above-mentioned stages of Project implementation shall not be permitted. Funding for each stage of Project implementation shall be provided strictly within the maximum funding limits established for that stage under the Terms. Increasing the funding allocated to any stage at the expense of reducing the funding of another stage of Project implementation is prohibited.

By submitting an Application for the Call, applicants thereby confirm that they have complied with the condition that the submitted Project may not be

simultaneously submitted for participation in another call for proposals for the purpose of obtaining funding from public funds, nor may it be submitted if such a Project is or has been funded from other sources.

Based on the results of the Call, grant support will be provided exclusively for individual fundamental research projects that are not part of studies that have already been conducted or are currently underway. The grant is awarded to the Grantee in an amount equal to the full cost of the work required to implement the Project.

The terms and procedure for funding Projects depend on the amount of budget allocations provided in the state budget for the relevant year to finance the activities of the National Research Foundation of Ukraine.

Under this Call the NRFU grant funds may be allocated to the following cost items:

1) Direct costs:

- labor remuneration;
- payroll accruals;
- materials required for the performance of works, except for equipment and facilities;
- equipment and facilities;
- business trip expenses.

2) Indirect costs

The total amount of indirect costs (costs not directly related to the conduct of research but necessary to ensure its full implementation) cannot exceed 15% of 'Direct Costs' within each stage of project implementation. Such costs may include: remuneration and accruals for the remuneration of personnel, in particular, employees of scientific and organization services, financial services, legal services, HR services, purchase department, etc. who will be involved in servicing the Agreement. Such expenses may not exceed 5% of the total amount of the 'Direct costs' cost item for each Project stage, as well as, where a sufficiently justified need exists, other indirect costs.

3) Other costs – costs that are not reflected in the above-mentioned cost items, but are necessary for Project implementation, in particular, costs of services. This cost

item may include costs for:

- publications,
- obtaining patents,
- access to research equipment for research and scientific and technical (experimental) developments,
- purchase of software,
- organizational fees for participation in scientific conferences and other scientific events,
- organizing and conducting scientific and communication events,
- access to databases, libraries, etc.

NOTE: see Methodological Recommendations for planning the budgeted cost of a Project under the ‘Excellent Fundamental Science in Ukraine 2027–2029’ Call ([link](#))

All expenses must be justified in form and content, as specified in the scope of financing by the cost items with their economic justifications.

The Project Cost Estimate should indicate the employment (in months) of the PI and each Project implementer.

If the Project involves the purchase of equipment and facilities worth more than UAH 200 thousand per unit with the grant support from the Foundation, a document containing a detailed feasibility study of the need to purchase the equipment (facilities) in the approved [form](#) is attached to the Application. The preparation of the feasibility study of the need to purchase equipment (facilities) must necessarily involve staff from the financial services, structural units responsible for procurement (including tender procedures), and other relevant departments of the participating institution.

Note: the feasibility study of the need to purchase equipment (facilities) is signed by the head of the legal entity on behalf of which the Application is submitted, the head of the financial department of the legal entity on behalf of which the Application is submitted, and the PI.

The grant funds may not be used for:

- payment for intermediary services;
- preparation of project applications for obtaining grant support;
- purchase of goods, performance of works, or provision of services not related to the implementation of the Project;
- payment for goods, works, or services that have been or will be financed from other sources, either before or after the signing of the Agreement;
- expenses related to the maintenance of institutions or organizations, including those participating in the Project, beyond the allowable limit for indirect (overhead) costs established in the Agreement.

VIII. NUMBER OF REVIEWERS CONDUCTING SCIENTIFIC AND SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEWING OF THE PROJECT

Scientific and scientific and technical reviewing of the Project submitted to the Call is performed by 3 reviewers, at least one of which shall be a foreign reviewer.

Upon a justified recommendation from the Call Commission, the Scientific Council of the Foundation may decide to involve a Ukrainian reviewer in the assessment of the Project instead of a foreign reviewer. Such a decision may be made only if the Call Commission has taken all possible measures to ensure the participation of a foreign reviewer in the Project assessment, specifically: the Call Commission has contacted all foreign reviewers with research experience in a field closely related to the Project's subject area, who are included in the NRFU Expert Database of the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects' and either received refusals from them to conduct the review or received no response, in accordance with the provisions of the [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](#), including provisions regarding repeated communication with a potential reviewer to respond to the request. The Call Commission must report on the actions taken to secure the participation of a foreign reviewer to the Scientific Council of the Foundation in the submission recommending the involvement of a Ukrainian reviewer instead of a foreign reviewer.

Members of the Call Commission and and the Foundation's governing bodies, as well as authors of Projects submitted for participation in this Call may not be involved in scientific and scientific and technical reviewing.

IX. CRITERIA FOR THE NUMERICAL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECTS,

INDICATING THE ORDER OF PRIORITY AND COEFFICIENTS OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

The selection of Projects is carried out in accordance with the procedure defined in the [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.](#)

Assessment of Projects is carried out by independent reviewers according to the form and criteria approved by the Scientific Council of the NRFU.

Each Project is assessed according to the following criteria (with corresponding weighting factors):

- quality of the research planned and its relevance to the fundamental subject matter of the Call;
- the potential impact of the Project on the future development of science, engineering, technology, and society (in accordance with the Project's scope);
- the quality and realism of the proposed project implementation plan;
- the research activities and publication record of the PI and other authors of the Project, as well as the well balance within the team of authors.

Each criterion contains several sub-criteria for assessment, each with its own weighting coefficient.

Each criterion and sub-criterion is assessed by a reviewer on a 5-point scale, with the obligatory provision of appropriate justification

The number of points for a criterion is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points for the assessment sub-criteria for that criterion

The total number of points for a project is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points for the criteria multiplied by 20.

When assessing a project, a 5-point scale is used for each criterion with the following point values:

0	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.
1 – Unsatisfactory	Information as of assessed criterion is inadequately presented or has critical deficiencies.
2 – Satisfactory	In general, the Project meets the criterion, but at the same time there are significant shortcomings.
3 – Good	The Project meets the criterion, but there are some shortcomings.
4 – Very good	The Project meets the criterion very well, but improvement is possible.
5 – Excellent	The Project fully meets the criterion.

The following criteria, weighting factors, and form are used to assess the Project:

Assessment criteria	Rating scale	Weighting coefficient
<p>1. Quality of the proposed research and its relevance to the fundamental thematic area of the Call</p> <p>Within this section, the justification of the research project, its fundamental orientation towards addressing a relevant (pressing) scientific problem, the clarity of the formulation of the goal and objectives, their compliance with the current level of scientific knowledge, the novelty of the scientific idea, the originality of the scientific hypothesis, and the appropriateness of the selected research methodology and methods for testing the scientific hypothesis are assessed.</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean weighted points according to the criteria</p>	<p>0,3</p>
<p>1.1. Motivation and justification of the scientific concept: whether the current state of research and fundamental scientific problems requiring solution are adequately described with appropriate references</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,3</p>

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 1.1

0 points — the description of the relevance of the research does not include any references to sources; the fundamental nature and research problem are not described; the scientific concept is absent or contradicts the established body of knowledge in the field.

1 point — the description of the relevance does not contain references or they are irrelevant; the description of the relevance and the fundamental nature of the problem is fragmented and incoherent; the concept is not justified, the motivation is unclear and presented only formally without real argumentation.

2 points — references to sources are provided in the description of the relevance, but their number is insufficient or most of them are irrelevant; the problem is formulated unclearly; the relevance and fundamental orientation are not substantiated; the project concept lacks a scientific basis and the argumentation is absent or superficial.

3 points — the justification of relevance includes references to sources, but some of them are of a general nature or derived from non-scientific sources (for example, non-peer-reviewed publications, journalistic publications, textbooks or manuals); and/or the review of scientific sources is present but insufficiently structured or lacks coverage of key aspects; the problem is identified, but its relevance and fundamental orientation are justified only superficially without in-depth analysis; the scientific concept is described in general terms without a clear link to current research.

4 points — the description of relevance uses a sufficient number of sources, although some may be insufficiently relevant or outdated; the problem is formulated, but the justification of its relevance and fundamental orientation may lack detail; the scientific concept is clearly described and its connection with advanced research in the relevant field is demonstrated, although some logical inconsistencies or ambiguities remain.

5 points — the current research in the relevant field is described clearly and in detail, with references to appropriate sources (articles, reviews, monographs, etc.); specific fundamental problems requiring solution are identified and their importance is logically substantiated, with conclusions on relevance supported by recent scientific data; the scientific concept of the Project is well justified, demonstrating the link between previous research and the proposed solution; there are no logical inconsistencies or ambiguities.

Note: Particular attention should be paid to the quality of sources; priority should be given to peer-reviewed scientific articles, recent scientific reviews, monographs, etc. If the Project is based on the authors' previous research, this should be clearly indicated with references to their own scientific publications.

1.2. Novelty of the scientific ideas (including from the perspective of fundamentality)	0-5	0,3
<p><i>Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 1.2.</i></p> <p><i>0 points — the Project does not demonstrate any novelty; it is entirely based on copying previously published works; the research does not propose new approaches to addressing a fundamental scientific problem or suggests solutions that contradict the established body of knowledge in the field.</i></p> <p><i>1 point — the Project repeats already known solutions without significant modifications; the authors attempt to present the idea as new but provide no evidence of its uniqueness; the proposed ideas are obvious or trivial. The fundamental nature of the research tasks is declared only formally without proper justification.</i></p> <p><i>2 points — the Project idea is not fundamentally new but contains certain elements of originality (for example, applying an existing method in a new context); however, the novelty is not clearly substantiated and most concepts are borrowed. The fundamental character of the research tasks is stated superficially without proper detail or justification.</i></p> <p><i>3 points — the Project proposes modifications or improvements to known ideas without a radical departure from existing concepts; comparison with current research is provided. The fundamental nature of the research tasks is indicated to a sufficient extent, although without proper argumentation.</i></p> <p><i>4 points — the Project idea is original but may partially overlap with certain existing works, while complementing or modifying existing approaches; the novelty is demonstrated, although not all aspects of the Project are unique. The fundamental orientation of the Project is justified, although certain aspects require additional argumentation.</i></p> <p><i>5 points — the Project idea is highly innovative and has no direct analogues in the scientific literature; it demonstrates how the proposed approach fills a gap in existing research or opens a new research direction; the novelty is substantiated through comparison with relevant publications of recent years. The fundamental orientation of the Project is clearly supported by strong argumentation regarding its specific impact on the development of the relevant scientific field.</i></p> <p><i>Note: If the Project builds upon the authors' previous research, the novelty should relate to further development rather than repetition. Ideas with a high level of novelty often involve greater uncertainty; this is not a disadvantage, provided that the approach is well justified.</i></p>		

1.3. Clarity and relevance of the formulated research goal and objectives	0-5	0,2
<p><i>Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 1.3.</i></p> <p><i>0 points — the Project goal is absent or formulated incorrectly and does not correspond to the Project topic. The research objectives are not defined or have no logical connection with the goal.</i></p> <p><i>1 point — the Project goal is absent or formulated as a process (for example, “to investigate”, “to study”) without indicating a concrete result. The objectives are listed only formally and do not reveal the essence of the research; their wording is unclear, contains logical inconsistencies or duplication, and does not represent complete research tasks.</i></p> <p><i>2 points — the Project goal is defined but does not indicate a concrete result, does not contain a clearly formulated scientific problem, or is not related to the research subject. The research objectives are listed, but some of them are not specific or do not correspond to the goal; logical inconsistencies or duplication are present, and the objectives are not formulated as complete tasks.</i></p> <p><i>3 points — the Project goal is clearly formulated and includes a concrete expected result. The research objectives are logically connected with each other and with the goal and are formulated as complete tasks; however, some of them are too broad or too narrow, or there is a gap between the theoretical and practical components.</i></p> <p><i>4 points — the Project goal is clearly formulated, includes a concrete result, and is scientifically justified with a logical connection to the Project topic. The objectives are clearly formulated, logically connected with each other and with the goal, and represent complete research tasks; however, some objectives may appear too general or may not clearly reflect a specific expected result.</i></p> <p><i>5 points — the Project goal is clearly formulated, contains a tangible expected result, and is scientifically justified with a clear logical connection to the Project topic. The research objectives are fully consistent with the goal, specific, logically structured, and complete; they cover all aspects of the research problem, detail the steps required to achieve the goal, and their number is optimal, with each objective reflecting a specific expected result.</i></p>		
1.4. Adequacy of the proposed research approaches and methods and their correspondence to the goal	0-5	0,2

and objectives of the Project		
-------------------------------	--	--

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 1.4.

0 points — research methods are not specified or are completely irrelevant to the goal and objectives of the Project and do not correspond to the stated research field. The justification for the selection of methods is absent.

1 point — research methods are formally listed but have only an indirect connection with the Project goal or are outdated and ineffective for addressing the stated problem; preference is given to approaches that cannot ensure the achievement of the stated objectives. The justification for the choice of methods is superficial or absent.

2 points — research methods are specified, but most of them have only an indirect connection with the Project goal or are outdated and ineffective for solving the stated problem; only part of the methods enables the achievement of the objectives. The justification for the choice of methods is superficial and does not demonstrate the link between the methods and the expected results.

3 points — research methods are specified; most of them correspond to the Project goal and enable the achievement of the objectives, although some methods are outdated or ineffective for addressing the stated problem. The justification for the choice of methods contains certain inconsistencies or insufficiently detailed descriptions of their application in the specific research context.

4 points — research methods are specified, correspond to the Project goal, and ensure the achievement of the objectives; they are modern and effective for solving the stated problem. The justification of the choice of methods is reasoned, although there are certain shortcomings in explaining their effectiveness for addressing the research problem or in describing their application in the specific context.

5 points — research methods are specified, correspond to the Project goal, and ensure the achievement of the objectives; they are modern and effective for solving the stated problem. The justification of the choice of methods is well reasoned, and their effectiveness for addressing the research problem and their application in the specific research context are clearly described.

Note: The methods should be oriented toward obtaining specific research results. Stages of testing and/or validation should be foreseen within the implementation of the Project. The logical chain “goal → objectives → methods → expected results” should be coherent and consistent.

	Weighted average score	
<p>2. Significance of the project for the further development of science / engineering / technology / society (according to the thematic area of the project)</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 are considered.</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean weighted points according to the criteria</p>	0,2
<p>2.1. The potential importance of the expected results and the acquisition of new fundamental knowledge, formulation of hypotheses, theories, new methods of scientific inquiry, discovery of laws of nature, previously unknown phenomena and properties of matter, identification of patterns in the development of society, etc.</p>	0-5	0,4

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 2.1.

0 points — the potential impact of the expected results is not described or formulated too generally; justification of the impact of solving the scientific problem is absent; the scientific potential is not defined.

1 point — the potential impact of the expected results is described in general terms and formulated non-specifically; justification of the impact of solving the scientific problem is presented only formally or lacks logical reasoning; scientific potential is declared but not substantiated.

2 points — the potential impact of the expected results is partially described; justification of the impact of solving the scientific problem is provided but insufficiently substantiated; the potential contribution to the development of the relevant field of fundamental science is formulated in general terms.

3 points — the potential impact of the expected results is described sufficiently clearly; justification of the impact of solving the scientific problem is clearly presented; the potential contribution to the development of the relevant field of fundamental science is formulated convincingly.

4 points — the potential impact of the expected results is described comprehensively and substantiated; justification of the impact of solving the scientific problem is formulated in a deep and logical manner; the importance of new knowledge for the development of the relevant field of fundamental science is justified; the potential significant contribution to the formation of theories or explanation of complex phenomena is demonstrated.

5 points — the potential impact of the expected results is described comprehensively, consistently and convincingly; the potential impact of the expected results is formulated in a deep and logically structured way and has a high degree of theoretical value; a significant potential contribution is expected that may transform scientific understanding, initiate a new research direction or explain previously unknown phenomena within the relevant field of fundamental science.

<p>2.2. Effectiveness and appropriateness of the planned ways of dissemination of the results of fundamental research (including publications in Q1–Q2 journals for mathematical, engineering, natural, biological, agricultural and medical sciences; publications in Q1–Q4 journals for social sciences and humanities; articles in Ukrainian professional journals of categories A and B; monographs or other scholarly book-format publications with no more than seven co-authors)</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,4</p>
<p><i>Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 2.2.</i></p> <p><i>0 points — expected results do not have defined forms of dissemination; dissemination pathways are not presented or do not correspond to an academic level; publication formats are not specified.</i></p> <p><i>1 point — expected results have defined dissemination formats; however, the planned formats do not correspond to the academic level required for the dissemination of fundamental research results; the list of publications is unclear and not oriented towards scholarly publications.</i></p> <p><i>2 points — expected results have defined dissemination formats; however, the planned formats include only presentations at conferences or other scientific events and publication of conference abstracts; only general information about types of publications and publication formats is provided; the correspondence between the Project tasks and the planned dissemination channels is not described.</i></p> <p><i>3 points — expected results are planned to be disseminated only through conference abstracts and publications in relevant peer-reviewed Ukrainian professional journals of categories A and B; types of publications and publication formats are indicated; the correspondence between Project tasks and planned dissemination channels is described.</i></p> <p><i>4 points (for mathematical, engineering, natural, biological, agricultural and medical sciences) — expected results are planned to be disseminated in relevant peer-reviewed</i></p>		

journals Q1–Q4, taking into account the target scientific audience; types of publications and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project tasks and dissemination channels is described; the chosen dissemination pathways are justified considering academic standards and quality requirements.

4 points (for social sciences and humanities) — expected results are planned to be disseminated in peer-reviewed Ukrainian professional journals of categories A and B and relevant peer-reviewed journals Q3–Q4; publication types and formats are clearly specified; the correspondence between Project tasks and dissemination channels is described; dissemination pathways are justified considering academic standards and quality requirements.

5 points (for mathematical, engineering, natural, biological, agricultural and medical sciences) — expected results are planned to be disseminated primarily in high-quality peer-reviewed academic journals Q1–Q2; publication types and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project tasks and dissemination channels is justified; dissemination pathways are justified considering academic standards and quality requirements; the publication strategy corresponds to the highest standards in the relevant scientific field.

5 points (for social sciences and humanities) — expected results are planned to be disseminated in high-quality peer-reviewed journals Q1–Q2 and/or monographs or other scholarly book-format publications (no more than seven co-authors, not less than 10 author's sheets), electronic scholarly resources/products (electronic databases, e-archives, e-catalogues, e-libraries, e-repositories, etc.), and relevant peer-reviewed Ukrainian professional journals of categories A and B, taking into account the target scientific audience; publication types and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project tasks and dissemination channels is justified; dissemination pathways are justified considering academic standards and quality requirements; the publication strategy corresponds to the highest standards in the relevant scientific field.

<p>2.3. Openness and dissemination of the results of fundamental research among the wider scientific community and society (including participation in science communication and outreach events, publications in open access, organisation of and participation in scientific conferences at the international and national levels, use of the results in the educational process, placement in open electronic resources, etc.)</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,2</p>
<p><i>Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 2.3.</i></p> <p><i>0 points — the expected results do not npeđyc.mampue any forms of open access or dissemination; no measures for communicating the results to the scientific community or society are specified.</i></p> <p><i>1 point — the expected results include only general references to openness or public communication (for example, “presentations” or “publications”), without specifying formats, channels or target audiences.</i></p> <p><i>2 points — the expected results include defined forms of open dissemination (participation in conferences, open-access publications, etc.), but without a clear strategy or logic of science communication; the topic and target audience are not considered.</i></p> <p><i>3 points — the expected results include clearly specified forms of openness and dissemination (participation in conferences, use in the educational process, placement in open resources, etc.); the channels and formats are described, but the justification for their selection or their impact on a broader audience is presented only superficially.</i></p> <p><i>4 points — the expected results include clearly defined and justified forms of openness and science communication; the channels (conferences, media, educational platforms, public lectures, etc.) correspond to the content of the research and are addressed to the appropriate target audience; the expected approaches for communicating the results are described.</i></p> <p><i>5 points — the expected results include a well-developed strategy for openness and</i></p>		

<p><i>science communication; effective and content-relevant dissemination channels are described (international conferences, open-access publications, educational programmes, public events, etc.); target audiences, communication formats and the expected societal impact are clearly defined.</i></p>		
	<p>Weighted average score</p>	
<p>3. Quality and feasibility of the proposed project implementation plan</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; possible risks of project implementation and the proposed ways to prevent or address them.</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean weighted points according to the criteria</p>	<p>0,2</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 with the indication of specific results and performance indicators, and their logical sequence</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,4</p>
--	------------	------------

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 3.1.

0 points — the work plan is absent or unstructured; time frames are not defined. The stages of the research are not formulated or contradict each other. Intermediate goals and performance indicators are not defined. Logical sequence is absent.

1 point — the work plan is unstructured; time frames are defined but unrealistic or do not reflect the complexity of the tasks. Intermediate goals and performance indicators are not defined. Logical sequence is absent.

2 points — the work plan is structured; time frames are defined, but most of them are unrealistic. Intermediate goals are absent, and performance indicators are not clearly defined. The logical sequence is disrupted: the stages do not lead to the final result.

3 points — the work plan is structured; time frames are defined, but some of them are unrealistic. Intermediate goals are defined but do not include clear performance indicators. The logical sequence of stages is partially disrupted: some tasks are not connected or duplicate each other.

4 points — the work plan is structured; time frames are defined and realistic. Intermediate goals are defined, but some of them are insufficiently specific, and the performance indicators do not contain clearly measurable parameters. The sequence of stages is logical, but there are minor gaps in the links between certain tasks.

5 points — the work plan is structured; time frames are defined and realistic. Intermediate goals are clearly defined, and performance indicators are measurable. The sequence of stages is logical; each subsequent stage follows from the previous one and corresponds to the overall structure of the project.

<p>3.2. Balance and reasonableness of the overall project budget; clarity of the description of equipment and materials planned for the project implementation, adequacy of their price in the budget (if such purchases are planned in the Project), and the available material and technical base</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,4</p>
---	------------	------------

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 3.2.

0 points — the budget is absent or prepared in an arbitrary form without a breakdown of costs; the indicated expenses are not related to the purpose and tasks of the project. The material and technical base and equipment are not described at all or do not correspond to the stated research tasks.

1 point — the budget is prepared without a clear structure; justification of expenses is absent or does not correspond to the project tasks. The material and technical base and equipment are described, but they do not ensure the implementation of the planned research tasks. The budget and the plan for the purchase and further use of equipment and materials (if planned) are not specified or contradict the tasks of the Project.

2 points — the budget is prepared according to the main cost items, but their correspondence to the project tasks is not substantiated. The material and technical base and equipment (existing and planned) are described and correspond to most of the tasks, but they are insufficient or require significant upgrading or supplementation. The budget and the plan for the purchase and further use of equipment and materials are formal or not transparent; no justification is provided regarding the availability of equipment (for example, free use of external resources).

3 points — the budget is generally balanced; however, there are certain inaccuracies (for example, illogical distribution across stages) or the justification for certain expenses is unclear. Some cost items may be insufficiently detailed or irrationally distributed. The material and technical base and equipment (existing and planned) are described and correspond to most of the tasks, but they are insufficient or require significant upgrading or supplementation. The budget and the plan for the purchase and further use of equipment and materials are provided, but specific parameters (for example, models and/or technical characteristics) or procurement timelines are not indicated.

4 points — the budget is balanced; all cost items are justified and detailed, and their

correspondence to the project tasks is substantiated. The distribution of costs is logical, although certain items require clarification. The material and technical base and equipment (existing and planned) are described and correspond to the project tasks; it is clearly indicated which resources are already available and which are planned to be involved. The budget and the plan for the purchase and further use of equipment and materials are provided; specific parameters (for example, models and/or technical characteristics) and procurement timelines are indicated, although some details are not fully specified or potential risks of their implementation are not considered.

5 points — the budget is clearly structured, balanced, and fully corresponds to the project tasks. Each cost item is thoroughly justified; there are no inconsistencies or unjustified expenses. The use of funds is optimized, ensuring an efficient allocation of funding to achieve maximum effectiveness of the project. The material and technical base and equipment (existing and planned) are described and correspond to the project tasks; it is clearly indicated which resources are already available and which are planned to be involved, including their models and/or technical characteristics. The budget and the plan for the purchase and further use of equipment and materials are fully justified and realistic, and include specific mechanisms for risk mitigation (for example, backup suppliers or alternative working methods in case of delays).

<p>3.3. Availability and reasonableness of the assessment of possible risks and the proposed ways to prevent or address them</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,2</p>
--	------------	------------

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 3.3

0 points — risks are not assessed; their analysis is absent, or the indicated risks are not related to the project. No measures for their prevention or resolution are proposed.

1 point — risks are identified only formally (1–2 items), without specific analysis, or the identified risks are not related to the project. No solutions or mitigation measures are proposed, or they are ineffective or unrealistic.

2 points — the main risks are identified, but without analysis of their impact on the timeline, budget, or quality of the results; their assessment is incomplete or insufficiently justified. Proposed mitigation measures are general or ineffective.

3 points — the main internal and/or external risks are identified, and an analysis of their impact on the timeline, budget, or quality of the results is provided. Mitigation measures are general or lack a clear implementation strategy, specific tools, or allocation of responsibilities; alternative scenarios for critical risks are absent.

4 points — the main risks (both internal and external) are identified, and an analysis of their impact on the timeline, budget, or quality of the results is provided. Mitigation measures include an implementation strategy with specific tools or allocation of responsibilities; however, alternative scenarios for critical or unforeseen risks and mechanisms for their monitoring are absent.

5 points — the main risks (both internal and external) are identified, and an analysis of their impact on the timeline, budget, or quality of the results is provided. Mitigation measures include an implementation strategy with specific tools or allocation of responsibilities; alternative scenarios for critical or unforeseen risks and mechanisms for their monitoring are described.

Note: It is important that the proposed mitigation or resolution plans are effective and realistic. Reviewers should consider whether the necessary resources (time, financial, and human) are foreseen for implementing risk management and monitoring measures.

	Weighted average score	
--	-----------------------------------	--

<p>4. Research activity and publication track record of the Project PI and other Project authors, and the balance of the Project team</p> <p>Within this criterion, the research track record of the Project PI and Project authors, their integration into the national and international research environment, and the balance of the Project team are assessed. When performing the assessment, reviewers shall take into account the specific features of the research field, the types of research outputs, and the recognition and impact indicators typical for the respective research area and topic.</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per aspect is calculated as an arithmetic mean weighted points according to the criteria</p>	<p>0,3</p>
<p>4.1. Impact of the research results of the Project PI on the relevant research field at the national and/or international level</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0,3</p>

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.1.

0 — throughout their research career, the Project PI has no publications related to the Project topic and has not participated as an implementer in any research project in the relevant research field at the national and/or international level;

1 point — throughout their research career, the Project PI has individual publications that only partially relate to the Project topic, but these publications are not significant for the research field; the PI has not participated as an implementer in any research project in the relevant research field at the national and/or international level;

2 points — throughout their research career, the Project PI has individual publications corresponding to the Project topic published in recognised scholarly journals; has participated in the implementation of no more than one successfully completed research project at the national level;

3 points — throughout their research career, the Project PI is the author of publications in recognised scholarly journals whose subject directly corresponds to the Project topic; has experience of participation in successfully completed research projects at the national level;

4 points — throughout their research career, the Project PI has a substantial publication record in peer-reviewed national and international journals on the Project topic; has served as a project leader or implementer of successfully completed research projects at the national level;

5 points — throughout their research career, the Project PI has a substantial publication record in peer-reviewed national and international journals on the Project topic; has served as the leader of successfully completed national research projects and as an implementer and/or leader of international research projects.

4.2. Balance of the Project team and publication activity of the Project PI and other authors during the last five years

0-5

0,5

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.2.

0 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is inadequately composed; the qualifications of its members do not correspond to the tasks assigned to them. The Project PI and the authors have no publications or other research outputs confirming their

publication activity during the last five years;

1 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is unbalanced, and the qualifications of the majority of its members do not correspond to the tasks assigned to them. During the last five years, the Project PI and other authors have only isolated publications in outlets that are not recognised scholarly journals in the relevant field of research, do not possess an established scientific reputation and/or are not recognised by the scientific community as ensuring an appropriate level of scholarly peer review, which indicates limited publication activity during the specified period;

2 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is insufficiently balanced; the qualifications of the majority of its members correspond to the tasks assigned to them. During the last five years, the Project PI and other authors have individual publications published in recognised scholarly journals. This score may also be applied where the majority of the authors' publications were produced within large scientific collaborations without a clearly defined or leading contribution of the authors;

3 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is sufficiently balanced; the competence of the majority of its authors corresponds to the tasks assigned to them. During the last five years, the Project PI and some authors have publications in peer-reviewed national and international journals;

4 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is balanced; the competence of all authors corresponds to the tasks assigned to them. During the last five years, the Project PI and the majority of other Project authors have publications in peer-reviewed national and international journals;

5 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is well balanced; each author has a high level of qualification in the tasks assigned to them. During the last five years, the Project PI and the majority of other authors have publications in leading peer-reviewed international journals and/or monographs (or other scholarly book-format publications with no more than three co-authors).

A documented career break related to service in the Armed Forces of Ukraine or other law enforcement agencies, medical treatment, pregnancy, parental leave, or care for a sick relative is automatically added to the defined 5-year period.

4.3. Participation of the Project PI and Project authors in international and/or national research cooperation	0-5	0,2
--	-----	-----

Comments: Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.3.

0 — the Project team, including the Project PI, has no experience of international and/or national research cooperation;

1 — the Project team, including the Project PI, has only isolated cases of international and/or national research cooperation;

2 — the Project team, including the Project PI, has irregular research cooperation in Ukraine and/or abroad, confirmed by a small number of joint publications with limited impact in the relevant field;

3 — the Project team, including the Project PI, has regular cooperation in Ukraine and/or abroad, confirmed by joint publications or other formalised results of cooperation;

4 — the Project team, including the Project PI, demonstrates a well-developed and sustainable level of international and/or national research cooperation, confirmed by joint publications and participation in at least one joint research initiative, including a project;

5 — the Project team, including the Project PI, is fully integrated into the international and/or national research environment, confirmed by joint scientific publications with a wide range of research groups in Ukraine and/or abroad, as well as participation in at least two joint projects, consortia, or other forms of long-term cooperation.

	Weighted average score	
	Overall project score: weighted arithmetic mean of scores for each aspect, multiplied by 20	

Algorithm for generating the final numerical assessment of applications

For each Project, the indicator R of discrepancy between the scores S_1 , S_2 , and S_3 assigned by three experts is calculated:

$$R = \frac{SD}{S} \cdot 100\%,$$

where S is the arithmetic mean of the grades assigned, i.e.

$$S = \frac{S_1 + S_2 + S_3}{3},$$

SD - standard deviation:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{(S_1 - S)^2 + (S_2 - S)^2 + (S_3 - S)^2}{3}}.$$

1. If the indicator R of discrepancy does not exceed the critical value of 15%, the final numerical score of the application is determined as the arithmetic mean S of the reviewers' scores.

2. If the discrepancy exceeds the critical value of 15%, then:

a) each member of the panel ($j=1, \dots, N$, where N is the number of panel members) determines the degree of validity k_{ij} of each of the reviewers' scores S_i , $i=1, \dots, 3$ in points from 0 (bad) to 2 (good);

b) the final numerical score of the application is calculated as a weighted average of the reviewers' scores:

$$S = S_1\beta_1 + S_2\beta_2 + S_3\beta_3,$$

where

$$\beta_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N k_{ij}}{\sum_{l=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^N k_{lj}}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

X. INFORMATION ON THE METHODS FOR SUBMITTING DOCUMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE CALL AND METHODS FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF AN APPLICATION BY AN APPLICANT BEFORE THE DEADLINE FOR ITS SUBMISSION

Proposals and documents required for participation in the Call shall be submitted by the Project PI exclusively in electronic form in Ukrainian and English in accordance with the requirements set out in these Terms, with a mandatory confirmation of the Project author's consent to its implementation, via the official website of the Foundation (<https://grants.nrfu.org.ua>) using the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects'.

In order to submit an Application, the Project PI and other Project authors shall complete prior registration on the official website of the NRFU through the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects'.

Identification of the person submitting the Proposal shall be carried out during registration by means of a qualified electronic signature.

The Call applicant has the right to withdraw the Application before the deadline for its submission through their personal account in the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects'.

XI. INFORMATION ON THE PROCEDURE FOR GRANT SUPPORT PROVISION

After the Foundation adopts a decision to award a grant, an Agreement shall be concluded between the Foundation and the legal entity that won the Call. The Agreement shall define all necessary conditions for the implementation of the Project, including provisions regarding the responsibility of the Grantee and the application of sanctions (restrictions) in case of failure or untimely fulfillment of its obligations.

The period for concluding the Agreement shall generally not exceed 30 calendar days from the date the Foundation sends the Call winner a proposal to conclude the Agreement. If, within the specified period and due to the fault of the legal entity that won the Call, the Agreement between it and the Foundation is not concluded, the legal entity shall be considered to have withdrawn from further implementation of the Project. The Foundation may apply restrictive measures to persons who refuse to conclude the Agreement, including restrictions on their further participation in the Foundation's calls for proposals.

Funding of Projects shall be carried out through stage-by-stage transfers of funds by the Foundation from its registration account to the account of the Grantee in accordance with the Agreement concluded between the National Research Foundation of Ukraine (NRFU) and the Call winner (Grantee), in line with the Calendar Plan and the Financing Schedule for the implementation of the research, within the limits of the funds actually received by the Grant Provider.

Unused and/or saved funds during each stage of the Project implementation shall be returned to the Foundation's registration account within **three working days** after the Scientific Council of the Foundation approves the financial reports on the use of budget funds for the relevant year, but no later than **five working days** before the end of the budget period in which the Agreement was concluded.

All expenditures for each stage of the Project implementation must be carried out before the completion of the respective stage of the Project implementation.

XII. ANNEXES

1. Application form for grant support ([link](#)).
2. Guidelines for filling out the Application ([download](#))
3. Sample form of the Grant Agreement ([download](#)).