



Annex 5

Regulations for the Call for Proposals "ANM POSTDOCTORAL GRANTS 2024"

Criteria and Methodology for the Scientific Evaluation of the Final Report of the Grant and Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Final Report of the Grant

- 1. The Postdoctoral Researcher shall complete the Final Report of the Grant. The Final Report shall be subject to scientific expertise, which is organised by the LCS on behalf of RTU, involving two independent foreign experts for the scientific evaluation of the Final Report of the Grant.
- 2. The LCS shall provide foreign experts with access to the Information System for the Final Report of the Grant concerned and the Application for the same Grant.
- 3. Within three weeks of the signing of the expert's acknowledgment and the conclusion of the Expert Contract, the expert shall carry out a scientific evaluation of the Final Report by completing the Scientific Evaluation Form for the Final Report of the Grant.
- 4. The expert shall assess the Final Report against the following criteria:

	Individual/Consolidated Evaluation of the Final Report		
G	rant title:		
E	xpert(s):		
1.	Criterion: Scientific Quality of the Grant Application		
	The expert shall assess how the Postdoctoral Researcher has achieved the plans set out in the Grant Application by the end of the Grant. Chapter 1 "Scientific Excellence" of the Final Report shall be taken into account, while linking it to the Final Report as a whole and to the Grant Application. Here, the expert shall provide comments and suggestions on research opportunities after the end of the Project in order to achieve scientific excellence. The expert shall assess whether the results achieved during the period demonstrate research capacity and whether the results described are appropriate to contribute to the knowledge base of the scientific field(s).		
2.	Criterion: Impact of Research Results		
	The expert shall assess how the Postdoctoral Researcher has achieved the plans set out in the Grant Application by the end of the Grant. Chapter 2 "Impact" of the Final Report shall be taken into account, while linking it to the Final Report as a whole and to Part B of the Grant Application "Description of the Grant Application". In this field, the expert shall provide comments and suggestions on the impact of the Project and the dissemination of the knowledge gained, as well as on communication activities after the end of the Grant.		
	The expert shall assess how the Postdoctoral Researcher has achieved the plans set out in		

Part B of the Grant Application. Assess whether the plans described in the Grant





Application for identifying stakeholders, applying the right forms of cooperation and transferring the knowledge generated by the Project (e.g. in recommendations, guidelines, prototyping, etc.) have been implemented as planned. Assess the cooperation of the Postdoctoral Researcher with national and local authorities, non-governmental organisations and businesses. It shall be assessed whether the scientific outputs (publications, participation in conferences, registration of intellectual property) have been achieved according to what is planned in the Grant Application.

The expert shall assess whether the work on public awareness of the results of the research and the socio-economic impact of the results has ensured the transfer of knowledge generated by the Grant, involving the public and raising their awareness of the role of the Project in addressing the specific thematic issues of the Project.

The expert shall assess whether the international cooperation planned in the Grant (including writing new projects, joining international networks, etc.) has taken place to the extent foreseen and has contributed to the achievement of the Application's objective and to the capacity building of the Postdoctoral Researcher.

3. Criterion: Grant Feasibility and Provisions

The expert shall assess how the Postdoctoral Researcher has achieved the plans set out in the Grant Application by the end of the Grant. Chapter 3 "Implementation" of the Final Report shall be taken into account, while linking it to the Final Report and to Part B of the Grant Application "Description of the Grant Application" as a whole. In this field, the expert shall provide comments and suggestions to make the research more successful.

The expert shall assess whether the management of the Project has been effective, including taking into account the overall progress of the Grant implementation. Whether the Grant management and the risk plan foreseen in Part B of the Grant Application has been implemented where risks materialised and whether their solutions are credible.

- 5. The expert shall assess the Final Report with one of two ratings:
 - 5.1. Grant objective achieved;
 - 5.2. Grant objective not achieved.
- 6. Once both experts have completed and approved their individual evaluation of the Final Report in the Information System, the LCS shall provide both experts with access to the individual evaluation completed by both experts and shall disclose to each expert the identity of the other expert.
- 7. In the consolidated evaluation score of the Final Report, the two experts shall agree on a consolidated evaluation score in points, summarising the evaluations made in the individual evaluations and their supporting comments.
- 8. The Reporter shall prepare a consolidated evaluation score in points for the Final Report in accordance with the form in Annex 5 to the Regulations, taking into account the individual evaluations of the two experts, and agree it with the other expert before submitting it to the LCS in the Information System.
- 9. If the experts have given a rating of "Grant objective not achieved" in the consolidated evaluation of the Final Report of the Grant, the experts shall also indicate in the evaluation the percentage of achievement of the Grant's objective.





Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Final Report of the Grant

Individual/Consolidated Scientific Evaluation of the Final Report of the Grant				
Gra	ant title			
Me	mbers of the Commi	ssion:		
Exp	pert(s):			
1.	Criterion: Scientific Excellence			
	(comment)			
2.		Criterion: Impact		
	(comment)			
3.	Criterion: Grant Feasibility and Provisions			
	(comment)			
Grant objective				
achieved (%)				
Grant objective not				
achieved, percentage				
of objective				
evaluation score (%)				