

# INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDAS

## Project selection criteria

under

Programme European Funds for Smart Economy 2021-2027

Priority 2: Innovation-friendly environment

Measure: 2.1 International Research Agendas

### MEASURE DESCRIPTION:

IRAP projects support the establishment or development of specialised, world-leading research teams and organisations in which scientific excellence and international research competitiveness can be achieved.

The support is intended to implement in Poland the world's best practices in terms of: conducting world-class research, identifying research programmes and topics, personnel policy; R&D activities management and commercialisation of R&D results.

**Project evaluation takes place in three stages:**

- Formal evaluation stage
- First stage of substantive assessment
- Stage II - substantive assessment

Separate sets of criteria are provided for each stage.

**The project selection criteria are divided into:**

- Mandatory criteria YES/NO - a project failing to meet these criteria will be assessed negatively;
- Ranking criteria - a project that does not achieve the minimum number of points indicated in each criterion will be assessed negatively;

**General principles of project evaluation:**

- To meet the criterion, the project must obtain a "YES" in the Mandatory criteria and the minimum number of points indicated for the Ranking criteria.
- Projects which meet all criteria for each of the appraisal stages and the total number of points obtained for all ranking criteria (concerns stage I and II of the substantive appraisal stage) is equal to or exceeds the minimum point threshold defined for each of the project appraisal stages will be recommended for the next appraisal stage or for funding.
- The sum of the points obtained in the ranking criteria determines the place on the ranking list of projects recommended for funding.
- The final ranking list is created on the basis of the sum of points from stages I and II of the substantive assessment, taking into account the conclusive criteria.

- **Decisive criteria:**

If several projects receive an identical total number of points rounded to two decimal places and there is not enough allocation for a given call to fund all of them, the number of points received in the determining criteria, in the following order, will determine the order on the ranking list and funding:

1. Criterion: Establishment of a system for commercialisation of research results;
2. Criterion: The research agenda ensures that the objectives of Measure IRAP are met
3. Criterion: The way the IRAP unit is managed will ensure that the project objectives can be met.

## PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA:

### Formal evaluation stage

#### Mandatory criteria [Y/N].

##### 1. The application was submitted in accordance with the requirements of

Check if:

- a) the application is complete, i.e. all required fields have been filled in according to the in accordance with the Application Handbook and The Regulations for Project Selection;
- b) the application contains all required annexes completed in accordance with the Application Handbook and The Regulations for Project Selection;
- c) the application has been signed on the final and closed for editing version of the application by an authorised person in the Applicant's organisation (in accordance with the principles described in the in the CPR)

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A score of "YES" in this criterion is only possible if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the evaluation, according to the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

##### 2. Project eligibility.

Check if:

###### **a) The project will be carried out in the territory of the Republic of Poland.**

The Research unit indicated in the application is based in the territory of the Republic of Poland and the project will be carried out in the territory of the Republic of Poland<sup>1</sup>.

###### **b) The project is scheduled to run for at least 4 years<sup>2</sup>.**

###### **c) The project will be carried out in collaboration with at least one foreign research unit - hereafter referred to as the partner unit.**

A partner unit from abroad is any institution, having legal personality or autonomy to conclude a foreign cooperation agreement, which meets the definition of an

---

<sup>1</sup> In the case of commissioning the implementation of services, in particular research works, by the Applicant to a foreign contractor, including a research unit, the condition is considered fulfilled. This condition is also considered fulfilled if Measures are implemented outside Poland, which in scientific activity are usually performed in the international field - in particular training, participation in conferences or related to cooperation with a scientific partner from abroad, provided that it is demonstrated that such activities are necessary for the achievement of project objectives.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible to change the planned project implementation period under the conditions provided for in the Funding agreement.

organisation performing research and disseminating knowledge - in accordance with the as defined in Article 2 para. 83 of Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014 of 17 June 2014 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty.

We will check whether the Applicant has indicated in the application the details of the Partner unit from abroad that will take part in the project implementation and has attached its letter of intent, meeting the requirements indicated in the Application Manual.

**d) The Applicant has correctly identified the research team leaders, including the Head researcher of the project.**

We will verify that:

- i. The Applicant has indicated in the application a minimum of two and a maximum of four persons - among them the Head researcher of the project, who will be Research group leaders in the IRAP unit. These individuals shall hold at least a doctoral degree.
- ii. The head researcher of the project will be employed in the IRAP unit at least 0.75 FTE<sup>3</sup> and is also the principal author of the concept presented in the proposal.
- iii. Research group leaders (subject to (ii. ) above) will be employed in the in the IRAP unit on a 1 FTE basis<sup>4</sup>.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**3. The Applicant meets the requirements for its legal entity**

We will check that:

- a) The Applicant is a single entity with legal personality as defined in Article 7(1) of the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science and meeting the definition of an organisation conducting research and disseminating knowledge, referred to in Article 2(83) of Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014 of 17 June 2014.
- b) The Applicant has indicated the unit that will implement the IRAP project (IRAP unit). The IRAP unit may be a separate part of the Applicant (e.g. a centre within the university structure) or the whole Applicant entity may be indicated in the application as a IRAP unit.

---

<sup>3</sup> An exception may apply to a person implementing a European Research Council grant in the course of a IRAP project. In this case it is acceptable to work 0.5 FTE in the IRAP unit

<sup>4</sup> i.a.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**4. Eligibility of expenditure planned in the project**

We will check that:

- a) the amount of funding requested is in line with the limits specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.
- b) the planned expenditure is correctly allocated to the appropriate expenditure categories in accordance with The Regulations for Project Selection.
- c) the amounts requested are in line with the percentage limits for the individual expenditure categories indicated in the The Regulations for Project Selection.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**RULES FOR QUALIFYING A PROJECT TO THE FIRST STAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE APPRAISAL:**

Only projects that have met all the mandatory criteria at the stage of formal appraisal will be recommended for the first stage of substantive appraisal.

## **First stage of substantive assessment**

### **Ranking criteria:**

#### **1. The head researcher of the project has the scientific track record and experience necessary to deliver a project to create a world-class centre of scientific excellence**

We will assess the competence of the Principal Contractor taking into account:

- a) the quality and originality of the applicant's 5 most important scientific achievements in the last 10 years (publications, patent applications, patents, prototypes, etc.) and their impact on the development of the field to which the Research Agenda relates, as presented in the application, against the background of achievements in this field in the best scientific centres in the world.
- b) whether the applicant is recognised as an authority in his/her scientific field in the international scientific community, whether he or she has received prestigious awards or research grants e.g. from the ERC.
- c) the candidate's success in leading research units or in being a leader of research groups.
- d) Candidate's participation in advisory bodies / scientific councils of prestigious scientific institutions worldwide.
- e) The candidate's success in mentoring young early career researchers (PhD students, post-docs, others).
- f) the candidate's success in commercialising research results.
- g) the results of scientific or implementation research which the candidate has obtained within the framework of projects indicated in the application, financed from external sources, the value of which amounted to at least PLN 1 million and were completed within the last 3 years, and the impact of these results on the field to which the research agenda in the application relates. The results of these projects will be taken into account in the evaluation of the criterion and related successes.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

We will score the entire criterion on a scale of 0 - 6 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 6 - criterion met with excellence;
- 5 - criterion met to a very good degree;
- 4 - criterion well met;
- 3 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 2 - criterion not met.

**The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 3 points.**

During the evaluation process, it is **not allowed to** supplement or correct the application of the grant application in the part concerning the fulfilment of the criterion.

## 2. **Research group leaders (excluding the designated Head researcher of the project) are competent to conduct research in the project**

We will verify the information on the achievements and experience of each of the identified research team leaders separately.

We assess the competences of research group leader candidates on the basis of:

- a) the quality and originality of up to 3 of the applicant's scientific achievements (obtained in the last 10 years) in the field in which the research is to be carried out in the project against achievements in this field in the best scientific centres in the world.
- b) The candidate's experience in leading a research team or their potential to be a leader.
- c) the candidate's experience in implementing grant projects - being a project manager or project developer.
- d) the candidate's experience in commercialising research results and collaborating with the economy.
- e) the candidate's participation as a thesis supervisor or assistant thesis supervisor.
- f) the research results that the applicant has obtained from the externally funded projects indicated in the application and completed within the last 3 years and the impact of these results on the field addressed by the research agenda in the application.

### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

Each of the identified research group leaders is scored individually on a scale of 0 - 6 points, taking into account all aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 6 - criterion met with excellence;
- 5 - criterion met to a very good degree;
- 4 - criterion well met;
- 3 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 2 - criterion not met.

If any team leader is individually scored less than 3 points, the criterion is deemed not to have been met.

An arithmetic average will then be calculated from the scores of the individual leaders to denote the value of the score in this criterion.

### **The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 3 points.**

During the evaluation process, it is **not allowed to** supplement or correct the application of the grant application in the part concerning the fulfilment of the criterion.

## 3. **The research agenda ensures that the objectives of Measure IRAP are met**

We will assess the following features of the submitted agenda:

- a) the importance of the proposed research problem for the advancement of science worldwide, whether the proposed research has the potential to make breakthroughs or open new avenues in science. The submitted research agenda, which involves a holistic

- approach to solving a well-defined issue of high scientific relevance and allows increasing the transfer of research results to the economy, is assessed.
- b) originality of the approach in the planned research to the scientific problem set in the agenda, taking into account the state of research in the given field conducted in the best scientific centres in the world. The IRAP must be competitive on a global scale, constitute an innovative proposal, allowing the unit to secure its place among the world's leading scientific institutions in a given field and the recognition of Polish science in the world.
  - c) the feasibility of the research agenda, in terms of available resources for the project and time to achieve initial results.
  - d) planned collaboration between research groups. The research agenda should be carried out in research groups and by other R&D staff, e.g. visiting scientists, independent staff with PhDs and technicians. The project should be carried out by no less than two research groups. At the same time, the research groups should have a common research objective that is planned to be achieved through collaboration between all research groups.
  - e) clearly defined objectives (overarching and intermediate), milestones for project implementation  
excluding fundamental research, as well as key risks that may arise during project implementation and Measures to mitigate the identified risks.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

We will assess the criterion on a scale of 0 - 6 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 6 - criterion met with excellence;
- 5 - criterion met to a very good degree;
- 4 - criterion well met;
- 3 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 2 - criterion not met.

**The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 3 points.**

During the evaluation process, it is **not allowed to** supplement or correct the application of the grant application in the part concerning the fulfilment of the criterion.

## **RULES FOR QUALIFYING A PROJECT TO THE SECOND STAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE APPRAISAL:**



European Funds  
for Smart Economy



Republic  
of Poland

Co-funded by the  
European Union



Foundation for  
Polish Science

Only projects which at the first stage of substantive appraisal met all obligatory and ranking criteria and received a total of at least 14 points in ranking criteria 1, 2 and 3 will be recommended for the second stage of substantive appraisal.

**MAXIMUM POSSIBLE NUMBER OF POINTS AT THE STAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT: 18**

## **Stage II of substantive assessment**

### **Mandatory criteria [YES/NO]:**

#### **1. The project will be implemented in the defined areas and types of research**

Check if:

- a) the project does not concern activities excluded on the basis of Article 7 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1058 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 on the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund (OJ L 231, 30.06.2021, p. 159 and OJ L 261, 22.07.2021, p. 58);
- b) the scope of R&D activities described in the application for co-financing is in line with the "National Intelligent Specialisations" document in force on the day of announcing the call for applications.
- c) We will assess whether the research planned in the project involves industrial research or experimental development. Fundamental research is excluded from support.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A score of YES for this criterion is only possible if all the conditions contained in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the evaluation in accordance with the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

#### **2. The planned values of the product and result indicators are adequate for the project implementation.**

Environmental indicators are not assessed in this criterion - they are assessed in the in the criterion "The project meets the principle of sustainable development".

We will assess whether

- a) The scope of the project's planned tasks and expenditure is defined by means of output and result indicators,
- b) the output and result indicators available in the application form are adequately indicated for the support requested,
- c) the indicators are coherent, measurable, well defined, objectively verifiable and realistic to achieve,
- d) The Applicant set out how the baseline and end goal values for the product and Result indicators were calculated and how the planned indicator values were verified.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

The criterion will receive a score of 'YES' if the requirements indicated in its description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal or clarified, in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

### **3. Relevance of the expenditure planned in the project in relation to the subject and scope of the project**

Check if:

- a) the planned costs of involvement of the project team members are reasonable and reasonable and in accordance with the rules adopted in the Applicant's unit (based on the Applicant's declaration).
- b) the planned expenditure is in line with the cost eligibility rules set out in in the Eligibility Guidelines 2021-2027 in force on the date of announcement of the call and in the Catalogue of Costs annexed to The Regulations for Project Selection.
- c) the planned expenditure for the project is adequate and reasonable.
- d) the scientific and research equipment to be purchased is necessary for the proper implementation of the project and the planned value of its purchase is within the established category limits. If the equipment proposed for purchase is not unique in Poland, we will verify the substantive and economic justification of the need to purchase it within the project. The condition for the acceptance of the purchase of the proposed equipment will be the fact that objective conditions (organisational or technical) resulting from the nature of the planned experiments do not allow the use of equipment of this type existing at the Applicant or at any other research organisations.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal or clarified, in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

### **4. The project meets the horizontal principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination**

We will assess whether the project meets the requirements arising from the horizontal principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination, including accessibility for persons with disabilities and equality between women and men in accordance with Article 9(2)-(3) of European Parliament and Council Regulation 2021/1060.

The assessment of the project's compliance with the above-mentioned horizontal principles is made on the basis of provisions of the Guidelines on the implementation of equality principles under the EU funds for 2021-2027 and Annex No. 2 to the above-mentioned Guidelines.

The evaluation will be carried out separately in relation to each of the two aforementioned principles: the principle of equal opportunities and non-discrimination and the principle of

equality between women and men on the basis of the information contained in the Application for funding:

The principle of equal opportunities and non-discrimination:

We will assess whether the Applicant has demonstrated in the application that the project meets the horizontal principle of equal opportunities and non-discrimination, i.e. whether:

- a) the application shows that the project has a positive impact on the principle of equal opportunities and non-discrimination on the grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation,
- b) Applicant has demonstrated in the application that all products/services of the project will be accessible for people with disabilities in accordance with accessibility standards appropriate to the scope of the implemented project (including the concept of universal design), being an attachment to the Guidelines on the implementation of equality principles in the framework of the EU funds for the years 2021-2027 or in justified and described in the application, demonstrated the neutrality of the project's product/service within the meaning of these. Guidelines, including the inability to meet all accessibility standards.

For products and services under the principle of equal opportunities and non-discrimination, including accessibility for people with disabilities, the Applicant shall justify their positive or neutral impact.

The principle of equality between women and men:

We will assess whether the Applicant has demonstrated in the application that the project complies with the horizontal principle of equality between women and men, i.e. whether the application shows that the project complies with the principle of equality between women and men or is neutral towards this principle in justified and described in the application within the meaning of the Guidelines for the Implementation of Equality Principles under EU Funds 2021-2027.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal or clarified, in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**5. The project is compatible with the Charter of Fundamental Rights (CFR)**

We will assess whether the project complies with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union of 26 October 2012 insofar as it relates to the manner of implementation and scope of the project.

Compliance with the criterion will be assessed with reference to Articles 1, 3-8, 10, 15, 20-23, 25-28, 30-33 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The Applicant should provide in the application information on how, within the scope of its own capabilities and the scope of the project implementation and impact, the compliance of the project with the listed articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights or neutrality towards the listed articles will be ensured. At the same time, the Applicant shall ensure that its project is neutral with respect to the other articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal or clarified, in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**6. The project is in line with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)**

We will assess whether the project complies with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 13 December 2006 as regards the manner of implementation and scope of the project. Assessment of compliance with the criterion will be made with reference to Articles 2-7, 9 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Applicant should provide in the application information on how, within the scope of its own capabilities and the scope of the implementation and impact of the project, the compliance of the project with the listed articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities or neutrality with respect to the listed articles will be ensured. For the other articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Applicant shall ensure that its project is neutral with respect to them.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal or clarified, in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**7. The project meets the principle of sustainable development**

It shall be assessed whether the project complies with the principle of sustainable development as referred to in Article 9(4) of Regulation 2021/1060 of the European

Parliament and of the Council (The objectives of the Funds shall be pursued in accordance with the objective of promoting sustainable development as set out in Article 11 of the TFEU and taking into account the UN's Sustainable Development Goals as well as the Paris Agreement and the 'do no serious harm' principle. The objectives of the Funds shall be pursued in full respect of the Union environmental acquis), i.e. whether:

- a) The project will be implemented in accordance with the relevant environmental legislation related to the implementation of the project.
- b) The project will be implemented in accordance with:
  - ✓ with at least two of the principles from the 6Rs, i.e. refuse (refuse); reduce (reduce); reuse (reuse); repair (recover); recycle (recycle); think what you can do better (rethink) or
  - ✓ with at least one rule from the 6Rs or
  - ✓ a positive impact on other environmental aspects of the project (than the 6R principles) or
  - ✓ at least one principle from the 6Rs and according to the positive impact on other environmental aspects within the project (than the 6Rs).
- c) The Applicant has provided adequate environmental indicators:
  - ✓ Where compliance with two principles from the 6Rs is demonstrated, at least one relevant indicator has been provided for each principle;
  - ✓ in the case of compliance with one of the principles of the 6Rs, at least two relevant indicators are provided;
  - ✓ in the case of a positive impact on other environmental aspects, at least two relevant indicators are presented, one of which will improve the value of the indicator by at least 10% compared to the value of the indicator before the project;
  - ✓ in the case of compliance with one of the principles from the 6Rs and compliance with another environmental aspect, at least two relevant indicators are presented - at least one for the 6Rs and at least one for the other environmental aspect (than the 6Rs), with an improvement of at least 10% compared to the value of the indicator before the implementation of the project.
- d) Environmental indicators:
  - ✓ relate to the project being carried out;
  - ✓ are coherent, measurable, well-defined, objectively verifiable and realistic to achieve;
  - ✓ have defined baseline and target values and a means of calculating target values for indicators, as well as a means of verifying the achievement of target values for indicators;
  - ✓ are selected from the List of Key Indicators or are self-defined.
- e) Meeting the sustainability principle applies to the entire project.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of 'YES' only if all the conditions in the criterion description are met.

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal or clarified in accordance with the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

## 8. Managing the conflict of interest of team leaders

As part of the criterion, we will check that:

- a) all personal or capital ties of research group leaders (including the Head researcher of the project) with companies operating in the area of the project's scientific activity are demonstrated in the application in the area of scientific activity of the project.
- b) The Applicant's proposed way of managing the conflict of interest includes a regular way of reporting to the authorities of the Applicant or the entity in which the IRAP unit is established about the results of research being carried out in the IRAP unit and about the intention to grant related parties access to these results.

In assessing this criterion, we will base ourselves on the information provided in the application and that appearing in the publicly available KRS database.

In order to define personal or capital links within the meaning of this criterion, rules analogous to the definition of a link relationship from the Guidelines on the eligibility of expenditure 2021-2027 Section 3.2.2(8)(a-c) for procurement procedures have been adopted. Thus, a personal or capital relationship of team leaders with enterprises should be understood as a relationship consisting in:

- a) participation in a company as a partner in a civil partnership or partnership, holding at least 10% of shares or stocks, acting as a member of an advisory, supervisory or management body, proxy or attorney;
- b) remaining with an Entrepreneur: in a marriage, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in a straight line, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in the collateral line to the second degree, or in a relationship of adoption, guardianship or custody, or remaining in cohabitation with an Entrepreneur, his/her legal deputy or members of managing or supervisory bodies of enterprises operating in an area similar or tangential to the R&D activities of the Project;
- c) Remain with an Entrepreneur in such a legal or factual relationship that there is reasonable doubt as to their impartiality or independence in relation to the in connection with granting access to the results of the Project.

### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

A criterion will receive a score of "YES" if all the requirements indicated in its description.

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the evaluation or clarified, according to the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection.

## Ranking criteria:

### 1. Project implementation schedule

We will check that the project timetable:

- a) is realistic and adequate for the scope of the planned work;
- b) indicates that the proposed results can be achieved;
- c) is clearly defined and the tasks are necessary to complete the project and form a logical whole;
- d) identifies measurable milestones for each stage of the project.

#### EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:

We will assess the criterion on a scale of 0 - 4 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 4 - criterion fulfilled to a very good level
- 3 - criterion well met;
- 2 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 1 - criterion not fulfilled.

**The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 2 points.**

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

### 2. Establishment of a system for commercialisation of research results

The Applicant shall provide in the application a plan for the commercialisation of the research results.

We evaluate:

- a) properly defining an area of research that can lead to the creation of intellectual property with potential implementation value,
- b) Adequacy and feasibility of the planned strategy to commercialise the results of the research conducted in the IRAP unit,
- c) ensuring adequate administrative support for commercialisation processes, including the competence of the staff responsible for the effective transfer of the results generated by the project into the economy.
- d) Entrepreneur's plan to collaborate with entrepreneurs in the project on a commercial basis (in accordance with the *Framework Guidelines on State Aid for Research, Development and Innovation (2022/C 7388)*),
- e) In the case when the Applicant was previously an entity which implemented the IRAP (IR OP) project, the effectiveness of the system of implementing research results into

the economy existing in the unit is additionally assessed. The evaluation will be carried out on the basis of the description of the system of implementing research results into the economy, attached to the application.

**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

We will assess the criterion on a scale of 0 - 6 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 6 - criterion met with excellence;
- 5 - criterion met to a very good degree;
- 4 - criterion well met;
- 3 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 2 - criterion not met.

**The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 3 points.**

The information we verify in this criterion will be correctable in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

**3. The way the IRAP unit is managed will ensure that the project objectives can be met**

We will assess whether the governance set out ensures that the IRAP Unit becomes a globally recognised centre of scientific excellence that is able to effectively commercialise the results of its research.

We will take into account whether:

- a) the IRAP unit will be given autonomy to decide primarily on substantive matters (including, the selection of research topics), the selection of the best R&D staff, how to raise funds for its activities and whether the approach presented is appropriate to the purpose of the IRAP programme.
- b) if the IRAP unit is not a separate entity with legal personality, its organisational location within the Applicant's structure (e.g. a university, an institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, or a research institute) will be such that the Head researcher of the project will be directly subordinate to the Applicant's management (e.g. the rector or director of the institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences or the research institute).
- c) The Head researcher of the project will have the autonomy to make substantive decisions on project implementation, personnel issues and administrative issues related to the functioning of the IRAP Unit .
- d) It is planned that the IRAP Unit will monitor good practices used in the world's best centres of excellence and apply modern ways of managing a research unit.
- e) the role of the International Scientific Committee (a mandatory body) is planned, which makes recommendations on the selection of research team leaders

and research topics carried out in the IRAP unit and carries out an interim evaluation of the Head researcher of the project and research team leaders and possibly the role of other advisory bodies and whether the approach presented is appropriate to the purpose of the IRAP programme.

- f) the unit has presented the way in which it will collaborate with: a foreign partner unit, or other research unit, to achieve the objectives set out in the in the Research Agenda and whether the approach presented is relevant to the objective of the IRAP programme.
- g) The Applicant has outlined how the IRAP Unit will be supported in terms of, at a minimum, providing adequate (and relevant to the purpose of the IRAP programme) legal conditions to enable the project to take place and adequate conditions for scientific work.
- h) The Applicant has described the administration structure of the IRAP Unit to ensure adequate support during project implementation.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

We will assess the criterion on a scale of 0 - 6 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

- 6 - criterion met with excellence;
- 5- criterion met to a very good degree;
- 4 - criterion well met;
- 3 - criterion sufficiently met;
- 0 - 2 criterion not met.

**The threshold score required to pass the project evaluation is a minimum of 3 points.**

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the appraisal, according to the procedure specified in The Regulations for Project Selection.

#### **4. The laboratory space and equipment made available will allow the Project to be implemented efficiently**

We will assess whether and to what extent the laboratory space indicated by the Applicant and equipment dedicated to the project are adequate for the planned work in the project and the programme objective of creating a centre of scientific excellence in Poland.

In verifying this criterion, we will assess whether:

- a) the IRAP unit is to be located in one place so that the R&D staff has the possibility to exchange experiences on an ongoing basis. At the same time, it is possible to finance the work of the IRAP unit's employees performing tasks outside the basic space occupied by the IRAP unit, if this is necessary, e.g. if the project requires the use of unique apparatus, which due to its specificity and value

cannot be owned by the Applicant (e.g. particle accelerator, detector on the International Space Station or supercomputer).

- b) to what extent the laboratory equipment declared by the Applicant will enable the research agenda to be fulfilled and ensure the development of the IRAP unit.
- c) the conditions under which the Applicant will provide access to the space and equipment, i.e. whether they will be available free of charge, at cost or for a fee in connection with e.g. rent will ensure that the IRAP unit will be able to effectively implement the research agenda. The way in which the Applicant will provide access to necessary equipment that is not owned by the Applicant will also be assessed, if access to this equipment is necessary to carry out R&D activities in the project.

#### **EVALUATION PRINCIPLES:**

We will assess the criterion on a scale of 0 - 4 taking into account all the aspects indicated above.

Points mean:

4 - criterion met to a very good degree;

3 - criterion well met;

2 - criterion met sufficiently;

0 - 1 - criterion not fulfilled.

**The threshold score required for a project to pass is no less than 2 points.**

The information we verify in this criterion will be able to be corrected in the application during the evaluation, according to the procedure set out in The Regulations for Project Selection, provided that the page/word/character limits set out in the Application Manual may not be exceeded.

#### **RULES FOR RECOMMENDING A PROJECT FOR FINANCING AFTER STAGE II OF SUBSTANTIVE APPRAISAL:**

Only projects that have met all the Mandatory criteria and ranking criteria and have received at least **16 points** in total at the second stage of substantive assessment will be recommended for funding.

#### **MAXIMUM POSSIBLE AMOUNT OF POINTS AT STAGE II OF SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT: 20**

For financing, within the available allocation, only projects that have met all the Mandatory criteria and ranking criteria, as well as those that at the first and second stage of substantive appraisal have received a total of at least 30 points out of 38 possible points, will be recommended.