

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

‘Applied Science for the Resilience and Recovery of Ukraine’

(hereinafter – the Terms)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

1.1. Title of the Call for Proposals:

‘Applied Science for the Resilience and Recovery of Ukraine’

1.2. The purpose of the Call

To select projects for collective grants aimed at conducting applied research and scientific and technical (experimental) developments, focused on the creation of knowledge-intensive and/or competitive scientific and scientific and technical products that can be implemented in production, the social sphere, etc. (hereinafter referred to as the Project/Projects).

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 (hereinafter – Foundation, NRFU), 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 area of the Projects shall correspond to at least one of the priority branches, defined **exclusively** by clauses 1, 3-7 of Article 3 of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Priority Branches of Science and Technology Development’:

<https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2623-14#Text>.

Eligibility Criteria for Alignment of the Project with the Call Thematic Scope:

- 1) The Project shall be aimed at conducting applied research or scientific and technical (experimental) development, with the objective of producing scientific and scientific-technical outputs contributing to the recovery and strengthening of Ukraine’s resilience;
- 2) The Project shall correspond to one of the thematic areas listed below:
 - new technologies, materials, and engineering solutions to ensure the

resilience and recovery of industrial and technological systems, as well as the functioning of emerging sectors of Ukraine's economy;

- information, digital, and mathematical methods for modelling, optimisation, and management of processes under conditions of limited resources and increased risks;
- environmental safety and innovative technologies for the preservation, restoration, and sustainable use of natural resources;
- biomedical technologies, medical engineering, and rehabilitation systems;
- new or significantly improved socio-economic, organisational and managerial, institutional, and service solutions, models, systems, methodologies, and digital tools to ensure the resilience, recovery, and development of Ukraine;
- countering disinformation and manipulation in the information space and cultural discourse, aimed at strengthening Ukraine's information, cultural, and communication security;

3) the expected outcome of the Project implementation shall comply with the regulations of clauses 27–28 of Article 1 of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Scientific and Scientific and Technical Activities’.

The absence of information constituting a state secret in the Application materials shall be explicitly confirmed in a letter of guarantee issued by the legal entity on whose behalf the Application is submitted, signed by its head or an authorized official ([link](#)).

Responsibility for the presence of any information constituting a state secret in the Application materials rests with the head of the legal entity participating in the Call.

1.4. Duration (in years) of the projects to be selected based on the results of the Call.

The projects are expected to be implemented in 2027-2028 **in two (2) intermediate stages** of Project implementation (provided that the corresponding budget allocations of the Foundation are available for the respective year)*:

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

The deadlines for the intermediate and final stages of Project implementation shall be determined in the grant support agreement.

**Planning the duration of the intermediate and final stages of Project implementation shall be carried out taking into account the established timeframes for processing the reporting documentation submitted by the Grantee to confirm the completion of each stage of Project implementation (no less than 14 calendar days from the date of completion of the respective intermediate and final stages of Project implementation). By decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation, the duration of Project implementation stages planned in the Application may be adjusted at the time of concluding the grant support agreement (hereinafter – the Agreement), including taking into account and in accordance with the Foundation’s budget revenues for the respective year.*

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

*The requirements are formulated in accordance with the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment (<https://www.coara.org/agreement/the-agreement-full-text>)

2.1. General requirements.

Applicants for the Call on whose behalf Applications are submitted, may only be higher education institutions (as defined by the Law of Ukraine ‘On Higher Education’) of any organisational and legal form and ownership type, and research institutions (as defined by the Law of Ukraine ;On Scientific and Scientific-Technical Activities;) of state or communal ownership. Such legal entities may apply for the Call if they are duly registered in Ukraine in accordance with the law, meet the Terms of this Call, have expressed their intention to participate, have authorised the Project’s PI to submit the Application and the documents required for participation, guarantee the conduct of the research provided for by the Project at their facilities, the execution of the Agreement, and the approval/endorsement of the corresponding scientific results.

Legal entities whose founders, beneficial owners, or applicants are citizens of the aggressor state or the Republic of Belarus, as well as legal entities operating in temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, are not eligible to apply for the Call. These participation restrictions also apply to individuals and legal persons 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 partners in the preparation of the Application or the implementation of the Project.

Applications shall be submitted by Project teams (PI and other authors) consisting of at least 3 (three) members.

The number of early-career researchers in the Project team shall be at least 1 (one) for teams of 3–4 members and at least 2 (two) for teams of 5 or more members.

The Project's PI and at least one of its authors shall have prior work related to the Project's thematic area. The presence of such work shall be demonstrated in the Application through scientific publications or patents for inventions in Ukraine and/or other developed countries relevant to the Project's topic.

The PI and all authors of the Project shall hold a research degree (for graduate students and early-career researchers, holding a research degree shall not be obligatory), awarded or recognised in Ukraine by a competent state authority; shall have scientific publications in periodical journals, including those indexed in Scopus or WoS, within the last five years at the time of Application submission (except for graduate students and early-career researchers without a research degree); and/or scientific monographs or chapters in monographs in the respective field of knowledge within the last five years at the time of Application submission (except for graduate students and early-career researchers without a research degree).

The Application may provide for the involvement of up to two person of auxiliary staff in the Project, including higher education students (first or second cycle), without personal identification; such individuals shall not be counted as members of the Project author team, but the need for their involvement (with indication of the number of persons) shall be duly justified in the Application.

The team (the Project authors) may consist of researchers representing a single legal entity, as well as researchers employed by different legal entities.

A single individual shall not be listed in more than one Application submitted to this Call.

The PI and other authors of the Project may be implementers in another project funded by the Foundation, the financing of which is ongoing or has not yet started due to an incomplete procedure for concluding the Agreement with the Grantee. However, the PI of the Project shall not be listed in the Application for this Call if they are already the PI of a winning project of another Foundation's

call, the financing of which is ongoing or has not yet started due to an incomplete procedure for concluding the Agreement with the Grantee (at the same time, the Terms of the Call do not impose restrictions on participation as the PI of the Project for individuals who are the first or sole authors of scientific works awarded the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine Award named after Ihor Yukhnovskiy). This restriction that no individual may simultaneously participate in more than two projects funded by the Foundation within a single calendar year shall be duly considered when forming the Project team at the time of Application submission.

The PI and other authors listed in the Application shall not be included in another Application submitted to a different Foundation's call for which the selection procedure 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).

The Call shall be conducted in compliance with the principle of gender equality, including in the formation of the Project author team.

Project implementers shall not be employed abroad at their main (primary) place of work.

The PI and authors of the Project shall not be employees of the NRFU Directorate, the Head of the Foundation, or members of the Scientific Council and Supervisory Board of the Foundation.

The PI of the Project shall not be a person who is the head of the legal entity (applicant for the Call) on whose behalf the Application is submitted.

Individuals who are PIs or authors of Projects submitted to the Call shall not be involved in the organisation or conduct of scientific and scientific-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/enforcement measures limiting participation in Foundation calls shall not be eligible to apply for the Call.

The PI of the Project and the Call applicant shall be responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in the Application and its supporting documents.

The detection of false or misleading information in the documents submitted by the Call applicant shall be grounds for the Application to be removed from

consideration at any stage of the competitive selection process.

When submitting an Application for the Call and implementing the project, the project author 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 (<https://nrfu.org.ua/en/about-us/ethical-principles/>) including requirements regarding the prohibition of cooperation with representatives of the aggressor state and temporarily occupied territories.

Submission of Applications by researchers (the PI and other Project authors) who, as of the time of Application submission, have had scientific collaboration with representatives of the aggressor state, temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, or individuals officially associated with them after 24 February 2022, is prohibited. The same restriction applies to legal entities established by the occupying authorities in temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including individuals officially associated with them, after 18 March 2014.

Violation of these requirements shall be grounds for rejection of the Application at any stage of the competitive selection process.

Project authors submitting Applications, whose activities exhibit 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 demonstrating the absence of actual cooperation, together with the Application, for further consideration and decision by the Call Commission. Such explanations and evidence may be uploaded as one or more separate PDF files when submitting the Application in the “Documents” section.

2.2. Project PI

The PI of a Project in Mathematical, Technical, 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, shall have scientific publications in periodical journals indexed in Scopus or WoS, and meets the first criterion and at least two other criteria (for PIs who are early-career researchers - only the first one) defined in the Project PI questionnaire.

The age of an early-career researcher shall be determined as of the date of the

submission of the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’. The date of birth of the researcher submitting the Application shall be indicated in the curriculum vitae (CV).

Note: The information provided for in Clauses 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](#));
- letter of guarantee ([template](#)) of the Applicant for the Call, on whose behalf the Application is submitted;
- a Questionnaire of the PI according to the approved form (Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences) in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#).

The PI of a Project in the fields of Social Sciences and Humanities 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, shall have scientific publications in periodical journals indexed in Scopus or WoS, and meets the first criterion and at least two other criteria (for PIs who are early-career researchers - only the first one) defined in the Project PI questionnaire.

The age of an early-career researcher shall be determined as of the date of the submission of the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’. The date of birth of the researcher submitting the Application shall be indicated in the curriculum vitae (CV).

Note: The information provided for in Clauses 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](#));
- letter of guarantee ([template](#)) of the Applicant for the Call, on whose behalf the Application is submitted;
- a Questionnaire of the PI according to the approved form (Social Sciences and Humanities) in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#).

2.3. Project Implementation Features

The Grantee shall be responsible for the uninterrupted execution of Project tasks within each stage of its implementation and for the full completion of the Project.

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 Project implementation, the PI and other implementers may stay abroad for no more than three months in total during each stage of the Project. Responsibility for ensuring compliance with this requirement, as well as for ensuring the uninterrupted execution of Project tasks in accordance with the Project Calendar Plan, shall rest with the Grantee.

If, during their stay abroad, the PI and/or other Project implementers receive monetary remuneration (salary) from sources other than the Ukrainian institution where they are employed and/or from the Foundation's grant funds, they shall not receive salary payments from the Foundation's grant funds for that period. In such cases, the Grantee shall notify the Foundation by an official letter of the timing and fact of such remuneration (salary). Responsibility for compliance with this requirement, as well as for ensuring the uninterrupted execution of Project tasks in accordance with the Project Calendar Plan, shall rest with the Grantee.

A Project submitted for participation in the Call shall not be simultaneously submitted to another call for the purpose of obtaining funding. Projects that are funded or have been funded from any other sources shall not be eligible for submission to this Call.

The fact that the Project is funded by the Foundation from the state budget, as well as the Project number and title, shall be explicitly indicated in all publications, official announcements, information for media, social networks, other public sources, and during presentations at scientific events to showcase the results of research and scientific-technical (experimental) developments. Publications or announcements that do not contain this information shall not be considered by the Scientific Council of the Foundation when reviewing reporting documents on Project outcomes. If there are publications that include references to funding from various sources, the reporting documents shall specify which results were achieved using the NRFU grant support.

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

The Scientific Council of the Foundation considers the following as unacceptable forms of validation of the scientific work carried out by Project implementers: pseudo-scientific conferences (including congresses, symposia, seminars, etc.) and related publications (conference materials, abstracts, etc.) if their organizers/publishers are commercial non-academic entities whose main activity is the organisation of such events and publications on a paid and remote basis. The Scientific Council of the Foundation shall not allow such conferences/publications to be included in scientific reports on Project implementation and shall not consider them as indicators of the completion of Terms of Reference and the Project Calendar Plan.

When planning the Project, it is recommended to define how the Project shall comply with open science practices. This includes open access to publications and FAIR-compliant open access to data. In addition, it is recommended to consider how open science practices shall be integrated into the Project methodology and workflow.

The Project shall include a set of actions and strategies aimed at disseminating information about its progress and results in order to maximise its impact on individuals, organisations, and communities, including measures to promote the outcomes obtained. Dissemination of information about the Project's progress and results is an integral part of the Project and shall be carried out throughout its duration and after its completion. Each stage of the Project shall include communication related to the specific stage of research, detailing the structure and content of messages to be conveyed, the target audiences who would benefit most from them, and the channels most effective for their delivery.

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

For Projects corresponding to the first four thematic areas of Clause 2, section 1.3 of the Terms, the expected outcome of the Project shall be a material sample with a description of the equipment and technology for its production/ a prototype of a device/apparatus with draft or design documentation/ a patent application in Ukraine and/or developed countries/ a description of the technological process and/or a process map/ or a beta version of a software product that demonstrates the viability of the idea. The Project shall include a comparative analysis of the created scientific/scientific-technical product with existing analogues and, where possible, a draft commercial proposal for the created product.

For Projects corresponding to the last two thematic areas of Clause 2, section 1.3

of the Terms, the planned outcome of the Project shall be developed socio-economic, organisational and managerial, institutional, regulatory, or service solutions in the form of regulatory acts, normative documents, or scientific-methodological documents, scientific-methodological models, systems, methodologies, and digital tools, etc., which have undergone pilot implementation, demonstrated their effectiveness under real conditions, and are suitable for practical application and scaling to ensure the resilience, recovery, and development of Ukraine. The Project shall include the validation of the planned applied results.

Intermediate Result

At the time of submitting the report for the first intermediate stage of Project implementation, the Project implementers shall have at least one publication in professional Ukrainian journals (category B) or in peer-reviewed professional journals indexed in Scopus or WoS, as well as working materials demonstrating the applied results presented in the stage report (drawings, test results, photo/video materials, etc.).

Final Result

At the time of submitting the final report, the Project implementers shall present applied results with a description of the product, depending on the Project's objective:

- a new material, equipment, and the technology for its production;
- a prototype of a device/apparatus with draft documentation and technical specifications;
- a technological process and/or process map;
- a beta version of a software product;
- informational, organisational, educational, or methodological solutions, a draft regulatory act, normative document, or scientific-methodological documents, validated protocols, models, algorithms, digital modules, platforms or data analysis systems, recommendations, and implementation technologies, etc.

Among the final results of the Project, there shall also be at least one published article in journals indexed in Scopus or WoS. For Projects for scientific-technical research (developments), it is recommended to have a patent

application in Ukraine and/or developed countries.

The new product developed as a result of the Project shall be designed for implementation at enterprises, institutions, government authorities, or local self-government bodies in Ukraine, etc.

The intellectual property rights 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 standards and ethical norms respective to the specific scientific field, including those established by international regulations shall be considered by the applicant. The Terms of Reference (ToR) shall include a clear description of the ethics of the research, along with a plan for addressing the most significant ethical issues that may arise during the Project’s implementation. Responsibility for compliance with research ethics standards shall be ensured by the authors (implementers) of the Project and legal entities who are participants of 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 Project author team, gender discrimination shall be avoided, and equal opportunities shall be provided for the participation of researchers in Project implementation, 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 (if

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 (if applicable).

If artificial intelligence (AI) tools are used within the Project, the applicants 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 application of AI in 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 shall exercise control over the execution of Agreements. In case of violations of the Agreement terms, enforcement measures shall be applied to the Grantee in accordance with the law, based on the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation.

In the event of significant changes in circumstances that may lead to non-fulfilment of the Agreement, the Agreement may be amended, until the completion of the intermediate stage of the Project specified in the Agreement, to adjust the necessary terms for its implementation within the approved budget. Decisions on amendments to the necessary terms for Project implementation shall be made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation at the initiative of the Grantee. The Grantee shall submit proposals for amending the Agreement to the Foundation, including justification and supporting documents. The Foundation

shall review the proposals and provide the Grantee with a decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation no later than 20 working days from the date of receipt. If the Scientific Council of the Foundation approves the proposed amendments, a supplementary agreement shall be concluded with the Grantee regarding the amended terms for Project implementation.

After the completion of each intermediate stage of Project implementation (except for the final stage) specified in the Agreement, the Grantee shall submit to the Foundation both electronically and in a single printed copy the following documents, in the structure and form approved by the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation: a report on the intermediate results of Project implementation, a financial report on the use of budget funds, and other documents specified in the Agreement. These documents shall be a prerequisite for the decision to continue or terminate the provision of grant support for the Project. Such a decision shall be made by the Scientific Council of the Foundation upon the recommendation of the respective section of the Scientific Council, based on the review of the Grantees' reports.

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

The grounds for deciding to terminate grant support may include:

- 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 and/or the Legal Entity, adopted on the basis of a corresponding notification from the state financial control authority following the implementation of state financial control measures.

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 and conditions 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 budgetary 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 interim stage of the Project implementation, the Foundation shall apply restrictive measures to the Grantee/PI/Project implementers in the NRFU calls for proposals.

After the completion of the Project, the Grantee shall submit to the Foundation, both electronically and in a single printed copy, the following documents in the structure and form approved by the decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation: the final report on Project implementation, including a description of the obtained scientific result; a financial report on the use of budget funds (by stage); a report on the use of budget funds within the framework of Project implementation; as well as other documents specified 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 for the intermediate (final) stage of Project implementation.

As part of exercising control over the Grantee's compliance with the obligations defined in the Agreement, the Foundation shall analyse the reports on Project results and the use of budget funds within Project implementation and shall ensure that information on the Project results, together with the final report on its implementation, references to published scientific works, and the report on budget fund use within Project implementation, is published on the Foundation's official website **within five working days** for free access in the form of open data, in accordance with the Law of Ukraine 'On Access to Public Information'

In the event of violations of the terms and conditions 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.

The Project authors shall bear personal responsibility for the results of its implementation. In the event of a discrepancy between the declared scientific

result and the one actually obtained, the Project authors may be barred from participating in the Foundation's calls 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/ in the event that grant support is terminated by a decision of the Scientific Council of the Foundation due to improper fulfillment of the Agreement/ 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 10 April to 15 December 2026 (tentative).

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

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

To submit an Application the PI and other Project authors 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 in Ukrainian and English in electronic form on the official website of the NRFU (<https://grants.nrfu.org.ua>) (only using the Automated System 'NRFU Call for Projects').

To participate in the Call, a Proposal (in Ukrainian and English) shall be submitted, certified with the qualified electronic signature of the Project's PI, along with the documents submitted by the Call Applicant together with the Proposal, as specified in Section VI of these Terms.

No replacement or clarifications to the submitted Applications by the 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 of 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 the Applications for participation in the Call is performed automatically in the NRFU via 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 Application.

The Call Applicant shall have the right to withdraw a Proposal prior to the final submission deadline, which the Project's PI shall notify the Foundation of through their personal account.

For the purpose of conducting the competitive selection and organizing the evaluation of Projects submitted to the Call, the respective section of the Scientific Council of the Foundation shall, within 10 working days from the date of the announcement of the Call on the Foundation's official website, elect at its meeting, by open vote, a Call Commission from among recognized researchers in the respective field (with their consent).

Members of the Call Commission shall not include members of the Foundation's governing bodies or authors of Projects submitted to the Call.

The Call Commission shall carry out its activities in accordance with 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, taking into account 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 under the grant support programs 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.

Such a 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 hold research degrees (in accordance with Clause 2.1 of the Terms) obtained or recognized in Ukraine by a decision of a competent public authority, the age requirements for early-career researchers who are authors of the Application, as well as the 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 a case, any Application submitted to the Call that was not the first chronologically shall be rejected);
- the Project PI is already indicated as a PI of a successful project in an application submitted for another call for proposals of the Foundation, the funding of which is ongoing or has not been completed yet due to the incomplete procedure of concluding the agreement with the Grantee;

- the Project author (including its PI) is already listed among the authors in the Application submitted to another Foundation's call for which the competitive selection process 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 Yukhnovskyyi);
- the Project PI and/or other authors are already indicated as 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 yet 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 Terms or the form or 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 ratio of indirect costs to the total amount of direct costs for the Project as a whole and for each stage separately, as established by the Call Terms, which is set at 10% of direct costs;
- exceeding the planned level of remuneration for the Project implementers and auxiliary staff beyond the recommended maximum monthly salaries specified in the [Methodological recommendations for planning the Project budget under the Call](#);
- exceeding the planned ratio of remuneration for personnel, including employees of scientific-organizational, financial, legal, HR services, procurement departments, etc., involved in servicing the Agreement, to the total amount of direct costs for the Project as a whole and for each stage separately, beyond the allowable limit established by the Call, which is set at 5% of direct costs;
- absence of or non-compliance with the form of the technical and economic justification for the necessity of equipment (facilities) acquisition, as established by these Terms;
- discrepancies between the absolute values of costs provided in commercial proposals (for units of equipment/facilities costing more than UAH 200,000) and the values of the corresponding cost item in the financing breakdown with its economic justification;
- exceeding the planned total amount of costs under the budget items

‘Remuneration’ and ‘Payroll charges,’ which is set at UAH 2,000,000 for each stage of Project implementation;

- absence of or non-compliance with the form and content, as established by these Terms, of the financing breakdown under budget items with their economic justification, including discrepancies in absolute values between this document and the Application profile (section ‘Financing’);
- planning of work (tasks) under the Project beyond the Project duration established by the Call Terms (see paragraph 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;
- the existence of active 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 grounds in electronic form within three working days after the deadline for checking applications for compliance with formal grounds.

Criteria for the preliminary review of Projects (including compliance with the purpose, thematic areas and the Terms of the Call).

Within 10 working days from the date of completion of the Directorate’s final eligibility check of applications for compliance with formal grounds, conducts their **preliminary review regarding compliance with the Call Terms**, in particular, the criteria determined by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, detection of false information in the documents submitted by the applicant.

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

- inconsistency of the submitted Project with the purpose, thematic areas or the Terms of the Call (justification for such compliance is to be provided in the text of the Application);
- 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 reviewing 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;

- 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).

Non-compliance of the documents submitted by the Call participant with the Terms of the Call, in particular with the criteria for project selection established by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, as well as detection of false or misleading information in the documents submitted by the Call participant shall be grounds for rejection of the Application both following its preliminary review and at any time during the entire competitive selection process.

Based on the preliminary review of Applications for compliance with the Terms of the Call, in particular with the criteria established by the Scientific Council of the Foundation, if false or misleading information is detected in the documents submitted by the Call applicant, the Call Commission shall approve the list of Applications to be rejected. The Foundation's Directorate shall notify the respective Call applicant in electronic form of the Commission's decision to reject the Application on the grounds of non-compliance with the Terms of the Call, in particular the criteria for project selection established by the Scientific Council, or the detection of false or misleading information in the submitted documents, no later than three working days after such decision is made.

If the Application complies with the Terms of the Call and the documents submitted by the Call participant contain accurate information, the Call Commission shall send the Project to reviewers for scientific and scientific-technical review no later than seven working days.

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

- Panel of Natural, Technical and Mathematical Sciences;
- Panel of Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences;
- Panel of Social Sciences and Humanities.

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

Date and time of the start of application submission: **10 April 2026, 00:01** Kyiv time.

Date and time of application submission deadline: **11 May 2026, 23:59** Kyiv time.

Period for conducting scientific and technical reviewing and announcement of the results of the Call: until **15 December 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 list of Projects recommended for implementation with the grant support from the Foundation, and the amount of funding;
- 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.

VI. DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE CALL AND UPON SIGNING THE AGREEMENT

To participate in the Call, an Application (in Ukrainian and English) shall be submitted via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’ certified with the qualified electronic signature of the Project PI, **together with the documents submitted by the Call applicant along with the Application**. The Application may include links to photo/video files demonstrating the results of preliminary check of the feasibility of the proposed physical principle, technology, etc., the implementation of which is proposed in the Application.

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 respective document.

Documents to be submitted by the applicant together with the Application via the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’ (electronic form):

1. Consent of the Project authors for implementation of the Project (indicated in the Automated System ‘NRFU Call for Projects’ using a qualified electronic signature via the Project author's personal account).
2. A Letter of Guarantee from the Call applicant on whose behalf the Application is submitted in the approved form to confirm the commitment to ensure the conduct of the research and developments envisaged by the Project. [The Letter of Guarantee](#) (a scanned copy) shall be submitted in Ukrainian and signed by the head of the Legal Entity or its acting head.
3. CV of the PI and other authors in the approved form (an electronic copy, in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#)). All links provided in the document shall be active.
4. Questionnaire of the PI, in the approved form in Ukrainian ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences](#)) and in English ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences](#)). All links provided in the document shall be active.
5. A technical and economic justification for the necessity of purchasing equipment (facilities), signed by the head of the legal entity on whose behalf the Application is submitted, the head of the financial unit of the respective legal entity, on whose behalf the Application is submitted, and the Project PI (in cases where the Project provides for the purchase of equipment/facilities with a unit cost exceeding UAH 200,000), in the approved form (a scanned copy, in Ukrainian) ([template](#)).
6. Terms of Reference for the research and development, in the approved form (a

scanned copy, in Ukrainian ([template](#)) and English ([template](#))).

7. Calendar Plan for the research and developments, in the approved form (a scanned copy, in Ukrainian ([template](#)) and English ([template](#))).

8. Cost estimate by cost items with their economic justification in the approved form (a scanned copy, in Ukrainian ([template](#)) and English ([template](#))).

9. Explanations and evidence regarding the absence of collaboration with representatives of the aggressor state and/or temporary occupied territories (if necessary) (a scanned copy, in Ukrainian, personally signed by the PI).

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 Call winners, 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 shall correspond to the information in the documents submitted together with the Application.*

1. Agreement for providing grant support with Annexes in the approved by the Foundation form.

2. A Letter of Guarantee from the Call applicant on whose behalf the Application is submitted in the approved form to confirm the commitment to ensure the conduct of the research and developments envisaged by the Project. [The Letter of Guarantee](#) (a scanned copy) shall be submitted in Ukrainian and signed by the head of the Legal Entity or its acting head.

3. CV of the PI and other authors in the approved form (an electronic copy, in [Ukrainian](#) and [English](#)).

4. Questionnaire of the PI, in the approved form in Ukrainian ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences](#)) and in English ([Social Sciences and Humanities](#)), ([Natural, Mathematical, Technical, Biological, Medical and Agricultural Sciences](#)).

5. Informed consent from the PI, Project authors and other implementers (auxiliary staff) (in the approved form, in Ukrainian).

6. Declaration in which the head of the legal entity – the Call winner, on behalf of which the Application was submitted, and the Project PI confirm that the Project will be fully implemented at the basis of this legal entity in

accordance with the Application; the legal entity has the material and technical infrastructure, organizational and human resources necessary to ensure the full implementation of the Project and to provide an appropriate level of service under the Agreement; materials, equipment, and facilities to be purchased with the grant funds will be used for their intended purpose (i.e., to carry out the Project tasks and ensure full implementation of the Project); the grant funds provided by the Foundation will be used for their intended purpose in compliance with the principles established by the budgetary legislation of Ukraine, in Ukrainian, in the approved form ([form](#)).

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 in 2027 is up to UAH 160,8 mln, in 2028 - up to UAH 150,0 mln (subject to the availability of the corresponding budgetary funds (appropriations)).

The total amount of funding for the Call is up to UAH 310,8 mln (subject to the availability of the corresponding budgetary funds (appropriations)).

Total funding per Project is up to UAH 7 mln:

per first stage - up to UAH 3,6 mln.;

per second stage - up to UAH 3,4 mln.

The total amount of expenditures under the cost items 'Labor remuneration' and 'Payroll accruals' shall not exceed UAH 2,000,000 for each stage of Project implementation.

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 shall be stated in UAH (Ukrainian hryvnias), without decimals or hundredths. No spaces are allowed between the digits (format: 3350000).

By submitting an Application to the Call, applicants thereby confirm that they have fulfilled the condition that the submitted Project has not been, and will not be, simultaneously submitted to any other call for the purpose of receiving funding from budgetary or other sources, and that the Project is not, and has not been, financed from any other sources.

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

The grant is provided to the Grantee in the amount covering the full cost of the work necessary for the implementation of the Project.

Project funding is carried out through phased transfers of funds by the grantor from its registration account to the accounts of the Grantee in accordance with the Agreement concluded between the Foundation and the organization awarded the grant (the Grantee), in line with the Project's Calendar Plan and Financing Schedule for conducting the research and developments, and within the limits of the funding actually received by the grantor.

Unused and/or saved funds for each stage of 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 corresponding year, but no later than five working days before the end of the budget period in which the Agreement was concluded.

All actual expenses for each stage of Project implementation shall be incurred before the completion of the respective stage of the Project.

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 applied research or scientific and technical (experimental) developments but are necessary to ensure its full implementation) cannot exceed 10% of 'Direct Costs' within each stage of project implementation. Such costs may include:

- payment of utility expenses related to the implementation of the Project;
- 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;

- other indirect costs.

3) Other costs (if applicable) – 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: scientific publications, obtaining patents, translations, rental of scientific equipment and equipment for the technological process of producing a new material, payment for services for manufacturing a prototype device according to the Grantee's design documentation, access to databases, libraries, etc.

Note 1: see [“Methodological recommendations for planning the budgeted cost of a Project under the Call”](#).

All expenses under each cost item shall be justified.

The grant cannot be used for the purchase of stationery, office equipment and supplies, office computers, multimedia and copying equipment, cartridges, storage devices, etc., unless directly related to the implementation of specific scientific tasks of the Project.

If the project provides for 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) shall necessarily involve staff from the financial services, structural units responsible for procurement (including tender procedures), and other respective departments of the applying 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.*

After the results of the Call are announced, the winning institution shall submit a declaration in which the head of the winning institution and the Project PI confirm that the Project will be implemented at the winning institution in full, in accordance with the Application; that the institution has the material and technical base, organizational resources, and a team of performers sufficient to ensure the full implementation of the Project; and that any equipment purchased with the grant funds will be used for its intended purpose (i.e., for carrying out the Project tasks and ensuring full implementation of the Project).

Note 4: The Project PI shall inform the supplier about the submission of the commercial proposal to the Foundation as part of the Application.

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 TECHNICAL REVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Scientific and technical review 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 shall 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 SELECTION AND 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 defined by the Call conditions and approved by the Scientific Council of the NRFU.

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

- quality and relevance of the research planned;
- the significance of the Project for the further development of science, engineering, technology, and society (in accordance with the Project's scope);
- quality and feasibility of the proposed Project implementation plan;
- the experience of the PI and other Project authors in creating applied scientific and scientific-technical products.

Each criterion includes several evaluation subcriteria with their own weighting factors.

The assessment for each criterion and subcriterion is carried out by a reviewer using a 5-point scale with obligatory provision of the appropriate justification.

The number of points for a criterion is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the scores for the subcriteria under that criterion.

The total number of points of the Project is calculated as the weighted arithmetic mean of the points by criteria, multiplied by 20.

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

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.
---	--

Unsatisfactory	Information as of assessed criterion is inadequately presented or has critical deficiencies.
Satisfactory	In general, the Project meets the criterion, but at the same time there are significant shortcomings.
Good	The Project meets the criterion, but there are some shortcomings.
Very good	The Project meets the criterion very well, but improvement is possible.
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 and relevance of the proposed research</p> <p>Within this section, the justification and significance of the research project, its orientation towards addressing a relevant (pressing) research problem, the clarity of the formulation of the goal and objectives, their compliance with the current level of research knowledge, the novelty of the research idea, the originality of the research hypothesis, and the appropriateness of the selected research methodology and methods for</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per criterion is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of scores according to the criteria.</p>	0.2

testing the research hypothesis are assessed.		
1.1. Motivation and justification of the research concept: whether the current state of research and the problems requiring solutions are adequately described with appropriate references.	0-5	0.3

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 1.1.

0 points – the Application does not contain a description of relevance and the problem statement; the research concept is absent or not relevant.

1 point – in describing the relevance, the authors refer to sources that are not relevant; the description of relevance and the problem is fragmented or inconsistent; the research concept is not substantiated and is presented formally without real argumentation.

2 points – the description of relevance includes references to sources, some of which are not scientific (e.g. non-peer-reviewed publications, journalistic publications, textbooks/manuals, etc.); the problem is formulated unclearly; the relevance is not substantiated; the Project concept lacks a scientific basis; the argumentation is insufficient or superficial.

3 points – the description of relevance includes references to sources, some of which are of a general nature; a review of scientific sources is present but insufficiently systematised or contains gaps in key aspects; the problem is identified, but its relevance is substantiated superficially without in-depth analysis; the research concept is described in general terms without a clear link to existing research.

4 points – the description of relevance is based on a sufficient number of sources, but some of them may be insufficiently relevant or up-to-date; the problem is formulated, but the justification of its relevance is not sufficiently detailed; the research concept is clearly described; the link with existing research is demonstrated, though certain logical inconsistencies or uncertainties remain.

5 points – current research in the relevant field is clearly and thoroughly described with appropriate references (articles, monographs, patents, etc.); specific problems requiring solutions are identified with a logical justification of their significance; conclusions on relevance are supported by up-to-date data; the Project’s research concept is substantiated: a link between existing research and the proposed solution is demonstrated; there are no logical inconsistencies or uncertainties.

Note: Attention should be paid to the quality of sources; priority should be given to peer-reviewed research articles, monographs, and patents. If the Project is based on the authors’ previous research, this should be clearly indicated in the ToR.

1.2. Novelty of the research ideas	0-5	0.3
------------------------------------	-----	-----

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 1.2.

0 points – the Project shows no signs of novelty; the Project is entirely based on copying existing works; the research does not contain new approaches to solving the stated problem or proposes solutions that, in the reviewer’s opinion, contradict existing scientific knowledge and data.

1 point – the Project repeats already known solutions without significant changes; the authors attempt to present the idea as new but provide no evidence of its uniqueness; the proposed ideas are obvious and trivial.

2 points – the Project idea is not fundamentally new but contains certain elements of originality (e.g. a new context for applying an existing method); however, there is no clear justification of novelty, and most concepts are borrowed.

3 points – the Project proposes modification or improvement of known ideas without fundamental changes to existing concepts; comparison with current research is provided.

4 points – the Project idea is original but may partially overlap with certain works of other researchers or the authors’ previous studies; however, it complements or modifies existing approaches; novelty is demonstrated, but not all aspects of the Project are unique.

5 points – the Project idea is absolutely innovative; it demonstrates how the proposed approach fills a gap in existing research or opens a new direction; novelty is supported by comparison with recent publications and/or other scientific results from the last 3–5 years.

Note: If the Project is based on the author’s previous research, 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 they are properly justified.

1.3. Clarity of the formulated research goal and objectives	0-5	0.2
---	-----	-----

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 1.3.

0 points – the Project goal is formulated vaguely or incorrectly and does not correspond to the Project topic. The objectives are not defined or have no logical connection with the goal.

1 point – the Project goal is formulated vaguely, incorrectly, or as a process (e.g. “to investigate”, “to study”) without indicating an applied result. The objectives are listed formally, do not reflect the essence of the research, their wording is unclear, logical inconsistencies or duplication are present, and they lack an applied nature.

2 points – the Project goal is defined but does not indicate an applied result or does not contain a clear research problem or is not related to the subject of the research. 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 they lack an applied nature.

3 points – the Project goal is clearly formulated and includes an applied result. The research objectives are logically connected with each other and with the goal, have an applied nature, but some of them are too broad or too narrow, or there is a gap between the theoretical and practical components.

4 points – the Project goal is clearly formulated, includes an applied result, and is scientifically justified and logically connected with the topic. The objectives are

clearly formulated, logically connected with each other and with the goal, and have an applied nature, but some of them may be general and not reflect a specific result.

5 points – the Project goal is clearly formulated, includes an applied result, and is scientifically justified and logically connected with the topic. The research objectives fully correspond to the goal, are specific, logically structured, have an applied nature, cover all aspects of the research problem, detail the steps for achieving the goal; the number of objectives is optimal, and each of them reflects a specific result.

1.4. Adequacy of the proposed research approaches and methods and their correspondence to the goal and objectives of the Project.

0-5

0.2

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring 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 applied field of the research. Justification of the choice of methods is absent.

1 point – research methods are formally indicated, have only an indirect connection to the Project goal, or are outdated and ineffective for addressing the stated problem; preference is given to abstract or theoretical approaches that cannot ensure the achievement of applied objectives. Justification of the choice of methods is superficial or absent.

2 points – research methods are specified, but most of them have only an indirect connection to the Project goal or are outdated and ineffective for addressing the stated problem; only part of the methods ensures the achievement of applied objectives. Justification of the choice of methods is superficial and does not reflect the link between the methods and the expected results.

3 points – research methods are specified; most of them correspond to the Project goal and ensure the achievement of applied objectives, but some are outdated and ineffective for addressing the stated problem. Justification of the choice of methods

contains certain inconsistencies or insufficiently detailed description of their application in a specific context.

4 points – research methods are specified, correspond to the Project goal, and ensure the achievement of applied objectives; they are modern and effective for addressing the stated problem. The choice of methods is justified, but there are shortcomings in substantiating their effectiveness and in describing their application in a specific context.

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

Note: Methods should be oriented towards achieving a specific result (e.g. technology, device prototype, process improvement, etc.). Stages of testing/validation under real conditions should be provided for. The chain “goal → objectives → methods → expected result” shall be consistent.

	Weighted average score	

<p>2. Significance of the Project for the further development of science / engineering / technology / society (in accordance with the Project’s scope)</p> <p>This section provides for the assessment of the clarity and justification of the prospects for further application of the research results with the aim of advancing science and new technologies, as well as the possibilities for implementing the research</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per criterion is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of scores according to the criteria.</p>	<p>0.4</p>
--	---	-------------------

<p>results in the economic and societal spheres. The completeness and potential effectiveness of the dissemination of research results, as well as the potential for commercialisation of the Project outcomes, are taken into account.</p>		
<p>2.1. Potential significance of the expected results and the generation of new knowledge, development of new solutions and creation of new materials, products, device prototypes, systems, technologies, and services, and/or their importance for addressing relevant practical scientific / technical / societal problems.</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.4</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><i>Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 2.1.</i></p> <p>0 points – the final applied result of the Project is not defined or is not clearly described (e.g. a new material, product, device prototype, system, technology, or service); or the final applied result is not reflected or is described unclearly.</p> <p>1 point – the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined (e.g. a new material, product, device prototype, system, technology, or service); the essence and novelty of the final applied result are clearly defined; however, the expected (technical) characteristics of the final applied result are not presented, or comparative analysis is conducted only with Ukrainian analogues.</p> <p>2 points – the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined and will be obtained in the form of prototype material, a product, a device prototype, a system, a technology, or services, etc.; the essence and novelty of the results are clearly defined; comparative analysis of (technical) characteristics is provided with Ukrainian and international analogues, distinguishing the impact of new solutions/technologies; however, no preliminary assessment of patentability and/or implementation potential is conducted, or such assessment is limited to Ukrainian analogues only.</p>		

3 points – the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined; the essence of the new solutions/technologies to be applied is clearly described; comparative analysis of (technical) characteristics is provided with international products, distinguishing the impact of new solutions/technologies; a preliminary assessment of patentability and implementation potential is conducted based on Ukrainian and international analogues; the application area is clearly defined, but without specifying potential Ukrainian and/or international manufacturers/users/consumers.

4 points – the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined and will be obtained in the form of a new material, product, device prototype, system, technology, or service, etc.; the essence of the new solutions and technologies to be applied in the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined; a comparative analysis of the (technical) characteristics, etc., of the Project’s final applied result has been presented, comparing it with Ukrainian and foreign analogues and highlighting the impact of new solutions/technologies; a preliminary assessment of the patentability/feasibility of implementing the Project’s result has been conducted through a review of Ukrainian and foreign analogues; the scope of application of the Project’s final applied result is clearly defined, with an indication of potential Ukrainian manufacturers/ users/ consumers; the commercial/social benefits of the Project’s final applied result are not sufficiently substantiated.

5 points – the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined and will be obtained in the form of a new material, product, device prototype, system, technology, or service, etc.; the essence of the new solutions and technologies to be implemented in the final applied result of the Project is clearly defined; a comparative analysis of the technical characteristics, etc., of the final applied result of the Project is presented, comparing it with Ukrainian and foreign analogues, with a clear distinction of the impact of the new solutions/technologies; a preliminary assessment of the patentability and marketability of the Project’s results was conducted through a review of Ukrainian and foreign analogues. The scope of application of the Project’s final applied results was clearly defined, with an indication of potential Ukrainian manufacturers/ users/ consumers; the commercial and societal benefits of the Project’s final applied results were clearly substantiated.

<p>2.2. Effectiveness and relevance of the planned pathways for dissemination of the Project results (expected peer-reviewed publications, presentations at international research conferences, dissemination of</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.4</p>
---	------------	------------

research results among the professional community, participation in innovation events, etc.)		
--	--	--

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 2.2.

0 points – expected results have no defined forms of dissemination; dissemination methods are not provided or do not correspond to the academic level; publication formats are not specified.

1 point – expected results have defined forms of dissemination; however, the planned formats do not correspond to the academic level of dissemination of applied research results; the list of publications is vague and not focused on scholarly publications.

2 points – expected results have defined forms of dissemination; however, the planned formats are limited to presentations at conferences or other academic events and publication of abstracts; only general information on types of publications and formats is provided; no correspondence between Project objectives and planned dissemination channels is described.

3 points – expected results are planned to be disseminated only through publication of abstracts and in relevant peer-reviewed Ukrainian journals of Categories A and B; types of publications and formats are specified; correspondence between Project objectives and planned dissemination channels is described. For scientific and technical Projects, submission of a Ukrainian patent application is provided for.

4 points (for Mathematical, Technical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural, and Medical Sciences) – expected results are planned to be disseminated in relevant peer-reviewed journals (Q1–Q4), taking into account the target scientific audience; types of publications and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project objectives and planned dissemination channels is described; selected dissemination pathways are justified with regard to academic level and quality requirements; submission of a Ukrainian patent application is provided for.

4 points (for Social Sciences and Humanities) – expected results are planned to be disseminated in relevant peer-reviewed Ukrainian journals of Categories A and B and in relevant peer-reviewed journals (Q3–Q4); types of publications and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project objectives and planned

dissemination channels is described; selected dissemination pathways are justified with regard to academic level and quality requirements; measures for dissemination of research results among the public and relevant stakeholders are provided.

5 points (for Mathematical, Technical, Natural, Biological, Agricultural, and Medical Sciences) – expected results are planned to be disseminated primarily in high-quality peer-reviewed academic journals (Q1–Q2); types of publications and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project objectives and planned dissemination channels is substantiated; selected dissemination methods are justified with regard to academic level and quality requirements; the publication strategy complies with the highest standards in the respective field; submission of a Ukrainian patent application is provided for; participation in innovation exhibitions or other channels for dissemination of applied Project results among potential consumers/users/manufacturers are provided.

5 points (for Social Sciences and Humanities) – expected results are planned to be disseminated in high-quality peer-reviewed academic journals (Q1–Q4) and/or in monographs or other book-type publications (no more than 7 co-authors, with a minimum volume of 10 printed sheets), electronic scientific resources/products (electronic databases, e-archives, e-catalogues, e-libraries, e-repositories, etc.), and in relevant peer-reviewed Ukrainian journals of Categories A and B, taking into account the target scientific audience; types of publications and formats are clearly specified; correspondence between Project objectives and planned dissemination channels is substantiated; selected dissemination methods are justified with regard to academic level and quality requirements; the publication strategy complies with the highest standards in the respective field; measures for implementation and dissemination of research results among the public and relevant stakeholders are provided.

<p>2.3. Implementation and practical use of the results of applied research, their accessibility to stakeholders (including technology transfer, cooperation with business/public authorities, pilot implementation, standardisation, commercialisation, development of open tools or services, etc., implementation of research results, increase in technology readiness level).</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.2</p>
---	------------	------------

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring sub-criterion 2.3.

0 points – expected results do not provide for direct implementation; there is no mention of interaction with potential users or customers.

1 point – expected results contain general references to possible application (e.g. “may be used in...”), but do not specify implementation pathways, partners, or end users.

2 points – certain forms of practical use are defined (e.g. pilot implementation, transfer of results, etc.), but without a clear implementation strategy; target users or areas of application are described superficially.

3 points – expected results include clearly defined forms of implementation (pilot projects, cooperation with organisations, prototypes, recommendations, etc.); potential users are identified, but the justification of their selection or implementation mechanisms is insufficiently elaborated.

4 points – expected results include clearly defined and substantiated implementation pathways; specific mechanisms of interaction with stakeholders (business, public sector, other users) are described; realistic scenarios for the use of results are provided.

5 points – expected results include a comprehensive and realistic strategy of implementation; end users, partners, and transfer mechanisms (commercialisation, scaling, integration into practice) are clearly defined; the expected economic, technological, or societal impact is described.

	Weighted average score	

<p>3. Quality and realism of the proposed Project implementation plan</p> <p>Within this section, the justification of the work plan and the clarity of intermediate objectives and their logical sequence are assessed; the clarity of the description of planned tasks with indication of specific results that can be verified; the alignment between the complexity of tasks and their timeframes; the adequacy of the equipment and materials indicated as necessary for the Project implementation in relation to its goal and objectives; the clarity of the description of equipment and materials and the adequacy of their cost in the budget.</p>	<p>From 0 to 5</p> <p>The number of points per criterion is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of scores according to the criteria.</p>	<p>0.2</p>
<p>3.1. Justification of the work plan; alignment of timeframes with the complexity of the defined stages and tasks; clarity of intermediate objectives and their logical sequence</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.3</p>
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Criteria and explanations for scoring the sub-criterion 3.1.</p> <p>0 points – the Project work plan is absent or unstructured; timeframes are not defined. The research stages are not formulated or are contradictory. Intermediate objectives are not defined. There is no logical sequence.</p> <p>1 point – the Project work plan is unstructured; timeframes are defined but are unrealistic or do not take into account the complexity of the tasks. Intermediate objectives are not defined. There is no logical sequence.</p> <p>2 points – the Project work plan is structured; timeframes are defined but most of them are unrealistic. Intermediate objectives are absent or not clearly defined. The logical sequence is disrupted: stages do not lead to the final result.</p>		

3 points – the Project work plan is structured; timeframes are defined but some of them are unrealistic. Intermediate objectives are defined but do not include clear measurable parameters for their achievement. The logical sequence of stages is partially disrupted: some tasks are not interconnected or are duplicated.

4 points – the Project work plan is structured; timeframes are defined and realistic. Intermediate objectives are defined, but some of them are insufficiently specific or do not include clear measurable parameters for their achievement. The sequence of stages is logical, but there are minor gaps in the links between certain tasks.

5 points – the Project work plan is structured; timeframes are defined and realistic. Intermediate objectives are clearly defined and measurable. The sequence of stages is logical; each subsequent stage follows from the previous one and corresponds to the overall structure of the Project.

Note: A critical aspect is the alignment between the plan, timeframes, and practical results. The highest score is awarded to Projects in which each stage directly leads to the creation of an applied scientific product, and risks are taken into account within the timelines.

3.2. Adequacy of the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) to the defined tasks	0-5	0.2
--	-----	-----

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring the sub-criterion 3.2.

0 points – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are not described (absent) or do not correspond to the defined tasks. There are no plans for their acquisition or use.

1 point – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are described, but are not suitable for the implementation of the planned research. The budget and plan for their acquisition and further use are not specified or contradict the Project tasks.

2 points – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are described and correspond to most of the tasks, but are insufficient or require significant upgrading or supplementation. The budget and plan for their acquisition

and further use are formal or not transparent; no justification is provided regarding the availability of equipment (e.g., reliance on free use of external resources).

3 points – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are described and correspond to most of the tasks, but are insufficient or require significant upgrading or supplementation. The budget and plan for their acquisition and further use are provided, but lack specific parameters (e.g., models are not specified) or timelines. The budget is partially unrealistic (e.g., significant underestimation or overestimation of equipment costs), and there is a high dependence on external factors (e.g., suppliers) without alternative solutions.

4 points – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are described and correspond to the defined tasks; it is clearly specified which resources are already available and which are planned to be acquired. The budget and plan for their acquisition and further use are provided, but some details are not sufficiently specified or there are minor risks regarding their implementation.

5 points – the material and technical base and equipment (available and planned) are described and correspond to the defined tasks; it is clearly specified which resources are already available and which are planned to be acquired, including their characteristics and functionality. The budget and plan for their acquisition and further use are fully justified and realistic; specific risk mitigation mechanisms are provided (e.g., backup suppliers, alternative methods in case of delays).

3.3. Balance and justification of the overall Project budget	0-5	0.3
---	-----	-----

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 3.3.

0 points – the budget is absent or prepared in an arbitrary form without a detailed breakdown of costs; the indicated expenses are not related to the purpose and objectives of the Project.

1 point – the budget is prepared without a clear structure; justification of expenses is absent or does not correspond to the Project objectives.

2 points – the budget is prepared according to the main cost items, but their correspondence to the Project objectives is not substantiated; the justification of expenses contradicts market data (overestimated/underestimated).

3 points – the budget is balanced; however, there are certain inaccuracies (e.g., critical tasks are underfunded while secondary tasks are overestimated), or the justification for certain expenses is unclear. Some cost items may be insufficiently detailed or disproportionately allocated.

4 points – the budget is balanced; all cost items are justified and detailed, and their correspondence to the Project objectives is substantiated. The allocation of funding is logical, although certain items require clarification (e.g., some items are overestimated or underestimated).

5 points – the budget is clearly structured, balanced, and fully corresponds to the Project objectives. 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.

Note: Particular importance is given to accounting for costs related to the development of a prototype, working model, technology, etc. The budget should reflect the priority of the applied result (e.g., costs for pilot production should outweigh those for theoretical research).

<p>3.4. Availability and justification 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 3.4.

0 points – risks are not mentioned in the Project at all, or the indicated risks are not related to the topic or tasks of the Project. No measures for risk prevention or mitigation are provided.

1 point – only 1–2 risks are mentioned formally, without explanation of their significance. There is no analysis of the impact of risks on timelines, budget, or

quality of results. Preventive measures are not proposed or are merely declarative (e.g., “will be addressed in the process”), without specificity.

2 points – several key risks are identified, but their impact on the Project is described superficially. There is no substantiated assessment of probability or scale of consequences. The methods for addressing or mitigating risks are described in general terms (e.g., “a time buffer has been built in,” “additional resources will be allocated”), without specifying specific tools or responsible parties.

3 points – both internal (organizational, staffing, financial, etc.) and external (supply, partnerships, regulatory, etc.) risks are identified. The proposal includes an analysis of their impact on timelines, budget, or quality of results, but without quantitative assessment or prioritization. Mitigation measures are described but lack a clear implementation strategy (no specific tools, responsible persons, or timelines). Alternative scenarios for critical risks are absent.

4 points – key risks are identified, and their analysis includes the impact on timelines, budget, and quality of results. Mitigation measures include an implementation strategy: specific tools are described (backup suppliers, insurance, additional funding, staffing reserves, etc.), and responsible persons are identified. Resources (time, financial, human) are allocated for implementation. However, alternative scenarios for unforeseen risks and monitoring mechanisms are absent.

5 points – key risks (both internal and external) are identified, and a full analysis is provided, including quantitative assessment of probability and impact. The proposal includes a clear risk mitigation strategy with specific tools, allocation of responsibilities, and a resource plan. Alternative scenarios for critical/unforeseen risks are described (e.g., a “Plan B” in case of failure of a key supplier/service provider or delays in equipment procurement). A mechanism for continuous risk monitoring is provided (regular reporting, checkpoints, early warning system). The Project provides for rapid response to crisis situations through a defined action algorithm.

Note: It is important to assess risks related to practical implementation (e.g., production delays, partner withdrawal, equipment delivery issues, etc.). Mitigation and resolution plans shall be effective and realistic. Consider whether sufficient resources (time, financial, human) are allocated for implementing risk management and monitoring measures.

	Weighted average score	

4. Research track record of the Project authors, including the Project PI	From 0 to 5 The number of points per criterion is calculated as a weighted arithmetic mean of scores according to the criteria.	0.2
--	--	------------

4.1. Quality of publications of the Project PI over the last 5 years Note: Any career break related to service in the Armed Forces of Ukraine or other security structures, medical treatment, pregnancy, parental leave, or care for a sick relative shall be automatically added to the specified period. Information on such a break shall be indicated in the CV and supported by documentary evidence (as an annex to the CV).	0-5	0.3
---	-----	-----

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

0 points – no publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals or journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

1 point – no more than 1 publication* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals, with no publications related to the Project topic in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

2 points – 2 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals, with no publications related to the Project topic in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

3 points – 3 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 1 publication in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

4 points – 4 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 2 such publications in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

5 points – 5 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 2 or more such publications in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

* A Ukrainian patent for an invention or a monograph with up to 3 co-authors is considered equivalent to a publication indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

<p>4.2. Quality of publications of the Project authors (excluding the Project PI) over the last 5 years</p> <p>Note: Any career break related to service in the Armed Forces of Ukraine or other security structures, medical treatment, pregnancy, parental leave, or care for a sick relative shall be automatically added to the specified period. Information on such a break shall be indicated in the CV and supported by documentary evidence (as an annex to the CV).</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.3</p>
<p>Comments:</p>		

Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.2.

0 points – no publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals or journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

1 point – no more than 1 publication* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals, with no publications related to the Project topic in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

2 points – 2 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals, with no publications related to the Project topic in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

3 points – 3 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 1 publication in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

4 points – 4 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 2 such publications in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

5 points – 5 or more publications* in the last 5 years in Ukrainian peer-reviewed journals and 2 or more such publications in journals indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

* A Ukrainian patent for an invention or a monograph with up to 3 co-authors is considered equivalent to a publication indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

4.3. Balance of the Project team: adequacy of its size and the level of qualifications of its members in relation to the Project's objectives and tasks	0-5	0.2
--	-----	-----

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.3.

0 points – the Project team is composed of specialists whose scientific publications and professional experience do not correspond to the Project topic; the number of team members does not correspond to the scope of work and/or the qualifications of the authors do not correspond to the Project's objectives and tasks.

1 point – no more than 20% of the Project team consists of specialists whose scientific publications and professional experience correspond to the Project topic; the number of team members is insufficient or excessive for the implementation of the Project tasks and/or the qualification level of some authors does not meet the key requirements of the Project.

2 points – no more than 40% of the Project team consists of specialists whose scientific publications and professional experience correspond to the Project topic; there is some imbalance in the distribution of responsibilities and/or the qualification level of the authors generally corresponds to the tasks, but in certain areas the involvement of additional specialists would be appropriate.

3 points – no more than 60% of the Project team consists of specialists whose scientific publications and professional experience correspond to the Project topic; the number of team members corresponds to the Project tasks and/or the qualification level of the authors in most key areas is sufficient for Project implementation, but there are minor shortcomings in the distribution of roles or resources.

4 points – no more than 80% of the Project team consists of specialists whose scientific publications and professional experience correspond to the Project topic; overall, the team appears balanced, roles are effectively distributed and/or the qualifications of all authors correspond to the Project tasks.

5 points – more than 80% of the Project team consists of specialists whose research interests correspond to the Project topic; the team is fully balanced, its size and composition are optimal, and each author has the appropriate qualifications, experience, and competencies to perform their assigned tasks.

<p>4.4. Experience of the Project PI and other Project authors in developing applied scientific and scientific-technical products</p>	<p>0-5</p>	<p>0.2</p>
--	------------	------------

Comments:

Criteria and explanations for scoring under sub-criterion 4.4.

0 points – no relevant experience or it is not substantiated. The Project PI and/or other authors have not participated in applied research or scientific-technical projects; there are no results of implementation or practical use of developments; no

supporting documents are provided (e.g., contracts, reports, implementation certificates, etc.).

1 point – minimal experience. The Project PI and/or other authors have participated in 1–2 projects as implementers without a leading role; results are limited or declarative; there is no confirmed evidence of implementation or such evidence is purely formal; the practical value of the results is not demonstrated.

2 points – limited experience. The Project PI and/or other authors have participated in several (2–3) applied projects, including possible roles as responsible implementers; some results show signs of practical application; implementation is partial or local; supporting documentation is provided, but the scope and significance of the results are moderate.

3 points – sufficient experience. The Project PI and/or other authors have participated in 3–4 applied or scientific-technical projects, including roles as project leader or co-leader; there is documented evidence of implementation (e.g., certificates, contracts, use in the activities of institutions or public authorities); results have an applied orientation and are used in practice, although the scale of implementation is limited (regional or institutional level).

4 points – substantial experience. The Project PI and/or other authors have held leadership roles (or key roles) in 4 or more applied projects; there are multiple confirmed cases of implementation of results (e.g., in the activities of public authorities, businesses, international organisations); results demonstrate a clear applied impact and scalability; experience in international or inter-institutional projects is present.

5 points – extensive (exceptional) experience. The Project PI and/or other authors demonstrate systematic activity in applied research and development with proven implementation results at the national and/or international levels; leadership of a significant number of projects (including international ones); results are integrated into policies, programmes, or regulatory documents, or are widely used in practice; there is evidence of sustained impact (policy impact, economic or social effect), as well as experience in attracting funding from various sources (public, international, grant-based)

	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 reviewers is calculated:

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

where S is the arithmetic mean of the scores 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 discrepancy indicator R 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 indicator exceeds the critical value of 15%, then:
 - a) each panel member ($j = 1, \dots, N$, where N is the number of panel members) determines the degree of validity k_j of each of the expert scores S_i , $i = 1, \dots, 3$, assigning a score from 1 (poor) to 5 (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

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

XI. INFORMATION ON THE PROCEDURE FOR GRANT SUPPORT

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, the Agreement between the Legal Entity – the Call winner and the Foundation is not concluded due to the fault of the Legal Entity – the Call winner, it shall be deemed that the Legal Entity – the Call winner has 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 calls of the Foundation.

Funding of Projects shall be carried out through stage-by-stage transfers of funds by the Foundation from its registration account to the Grantee's account in accordance with the Agreement concluded between the NRFU and the Call winner (Grantee), in accordance with the Calendar Plan and the Financing Schedule for the implementation of the research, within the limits of the actual funding received by the Grantor.

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 respective year, but no later than five working

days before the end of the budget period in which the Agreement was concluded.

All costs for each stage of the Project implementation shall be carried out before the completion of the respective stage of the Project implementation.

XII. ANNEXES

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