Annex 7
to the State research programme
"Letonika — Fostering a Latvian and European Society""
Procedure of the Open Call for Project Proposals

Methodology of the Performance of Expertise
for the Project Proposal, Project Interim/Final Scientific Report

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
1. Terms Used 2
2. Scientific Expertise of the Project Proposal 4
2.1. Individual review of the project proposal 4
2.2 Consolidated review of the project proposal 10
3. Scientific expertise of the project interim and final scientific report 10
3.1 Individual review of the project interim and final scientific report 11
3.2 Consolidated review of the project interim and final scientific report 13
3.3. Evaluation of the goal of the final scientific report of the project 13

Introduction

The Methodology of the Performance of Expertise for the Project Proposal, Project Interim/Final Scientific Report (hereinafter referred to as — the Methodology) is developed in accordance with the Cabinet Regulation 560 of 4 September 2018 "Procedures for the Implementation of the State Research Programme Projects" (hereinafter referred to as — the Cabinet Regulation) and in compliance with the Procedure for the open call hereinafter referred to as — the call) for project proposal dated 23 August 2021 of the State research programme "Letonika — Fostering a Latvian and European Society" (hereinafter referred to as — the Procedure) approved by the State research programme "Letonika — Fostering a Latvian and European Society" Implementation and Supervision Commission.

The Methodology is developed for independent foreign science experts (hereinafter referred to as — the expert) who perform the review of the project proposal, the project interim scientific report and the project final scientific report, preparing the individual expert review of the project proposal/project interim scientific report / project final scientific report and the consolidated expert review of the project proposal / project interim scientific report / project final scientific report.

According to Section 35(1) of the Law on Scientific Activity, State research programme is State commission for the performance of scientific research in a specific economic, educational, cultural, or other sector of priority to the State with the purpose of promoting the development of such sector.

The programme as State commission is a policy implementation mechanism with which the issues relevant to the sustainability and development of Latvia are identified and examined, for the solving of which it is necessary to strengthen the scientific capacity (including engaging new scientists and students) and to facilitate the development of knowledge base focusing on the work of Latvian scientific institutions. Considering the above, the programme creates favourable conditions for achievement of goals of the sustainable development of Latvia.

It is planned to attract the strongest groups of scientists for the implementation of the programme, in which the best scientists representing social sciences, humanities and arts and other sciences will cooperate to achieve the goal of the project.

The programme was established and is financed by the Ministry of Education and Science. The funds in the total amount of EUR 6 200 000 are granted from the State budget for the implementation of the programme.

The overarching goal of the programme is to establish inclusive Latvian and European knowledge society in Latvia, the basis of which is democratic values, Latvian language and culture. The programme implementation goal is to create solutions and knowledge to facilitate the sustainable development of the Latvian society and State. It includes the research of language, history, culture, identity of Latvians and ethnic minorities, research of education transformation opportunities, as well as the extension of the required human capital.

The programme is needed to develop the knowledge base in the social sciences and humanities, which is part of the national research and innovation system, which creates a broad and in-depth knowledge base that meets the needs of the public and addresses societal challenges. The programme was designed to ensure the implementation of the priorities defined in the Science, Technology Development and Innovation Guidelines 2021-2027, the Education Development Guidelines 2021-2027 and the Official Language Policy Guidelines 2021-2027, and to find scientifically substantiated solutions to the current development challenges of the Latvian state.

Social sciences provide an understanding of societal developments and address societal social development challenges, including those related to science, technology and innovation processes. The humanities form the identity of society and are an additional source of public value in the creation of new solutions and technologies. The programme is intended as an interdisciplinary research programme in the social sciences and humanities, which combines the thematic focus of the previously implemented State research program “Latvian Heritage and Future Challenges for the Sustainability of the State” and “Latvian Language”. The project identifies six thematic objectives for the development of the knowledge base in order to address the issues of sustainable development of the state and society:

1. Latvian history, identity of Latvians and ethnic minorities
2. Education transformation
3. Demography and migration
4. Innovative and inclusive governance
5. Development of the Latvian language in the 21st century and its national role
6. Diversity of the Latvian linguistics.

Duration of the project implementation is 36 months.

1. Terms Used

No	Term	Explanation
1.	**Scientific team**	scientific personnel and research technical staff which participates in the project implementation (persons who have the required technical knowledge and experience in one or several areas and who under the control of scientists participate in the scientific activity while completing technical objectives. Research technical staff consists of engineers, technicians, laboratory assistants, technologists, operators). A scientific team shall be composed of a principal investigator, lead participants of the project (if such required), and participants of the project.
2.	**Scientific personnel**	leading researchers, researchers, scientific assistants, academic staff[1] of an institution of higher education, and students (including also

[1] Section 27(1) of the Law on Higher Education

		researchers, students, candidates for doctoral degree and new scientists from abroad and diaspora).
3.	**Project applicant**	the project applicant is a scientific institution (hereinafter referred to as — the scientific institution) registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia (a subject of public law or a subject of private law) or a higher education institution, as well as complies with the definition of a research and knowledge dissemination organization[2]. The submitter of the project proposal is responsible for the implementation of the project and achievement of the project results in general.
4.	**Project cooperation partner - scientific institution**	a project cooperation partner is a scientific institution registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia and complies with the definition of a research and knowledge dissemination organization, participates in the project with its own staff or research infrastructure.
5.	**Project cooperation partner - public institution**	a public institution to which the performance of scientific activity is determined by an external legal act, its regulations or articles of association, participates in the implementation of the project with the property, intellectual property, funding or human resources in its possession or ownership
6.	**Principal investigator**	a scientist who manages the project and ensures the implementation thereof – plans and supervises the fulfilment of the project objectives, is responsible for his or her activity and the activity of other persons involved in the project in conformity with the objectives defined for the project, rules of scientific ethics, for timely drafting and submission of the documentation characterising the progress of the project implementation in accordance with the procedures laid down in Cabinet Regulation.
7.	**Lead participant of the project**	a scientist who implements the project or sub-project and is responsible for the implementation of the parts thereof.
8.	**Participant of the project**	a member of the scientific team who performs some scientific objectives in the project implementation and is responsible for the performance of respective parts thereof.
9.	**University student**	a student involved in the scientific team of the project is a student of bachelor's degree study programmes, a student of vocational study programmes, a student of master's degree study programmes (master's programme students), a resident in medicine; a doctoral student[3]. University students and candidates for doctoral degree shall be involved in the project according to the conditions specified in Paragraphs 21, 22, 23 and 24 of the Procedure.
10.	**Responsible contact person of the project applicant in the project (hereinafter — the project contact person)**	a natural person who has registered in the National Information System of Scientific Activity (hereinafter referred to as — the Information System) completes information on the project proposal, uploads annexes thereto and reports and also, if necessary, maintains contacts with the staff of the Council (the principal investigator may also be the project contact person) during the submission of projects. The project proposal shall indicate the project contact person in Section 1 "General information", Part A of the

[2] Regulation (EU) No 651/2014 of the European Commission of 17 June 2014 (Official Journal of the European Union, 26 June 2014, No L 187/1), declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/651/oj/?locale=LV)

[3] Section 44(1) of the Law on Higher Education

		project proposal. If there are cooperation partners in the project, their contact persons shall also be indicated.
11.	**Expert**	a scientist who performs an independent review of the project proposal, project interim scientific report and project final scientific report and the scientific qualification, evaluation competence and work experience whereof conform to the science sector and topic of the respective project proposal, project interim/final scientific report.
12.	**Project results**	scientific results of the project according to Paragraph 12 of the Cabinet Regulation and achievable results according to Clause 8 of the Cabinet Order.

2. Scientific Expertise of the Project Proposal

1. Scientific evaluation process of the project proposals shall be organized by the Latvian Council of Science (hereinafter referred to as — the Council).

2. If the project proposal meets the administrative evaluation criteria, the Council shall, based on Paragraph 35 of the Procedure, engage two or more accordingly appropriate experts for the scientific expertise of the project proposal.

3. Prior to obtaining access to the project proposal in the Information System, the expert shall:

3.1 confirm that he or she has no conflict of interest and also that he or she undertakes to meet the confidentiality requirements by signing Annex 5 to the Procedure "Certification on the absence of conflict of interest and commitment to respect confidentiality" (hereinafter referred to as — the expert certification) and send the latter via electronic mail to the Council;

3.2 conclude the contract with the Council — Annex 6 to the Procedure "Contract of Scientific Evaluation" (hereinafter referred to as — the expertise contract).

4. Having received the expert certification and having concluded the expertise contract, the Council shall grant an access to the expert to the project proposal and all necessary information in the Information System in order to perform the respective evaluation of the project proposal.

5. The expert shall perform the review of the project proposal by applying his or her professional qualifications and experience in the relevant science sector and by providing scientific justification for his or her opinion.

6. During the expertise, the expert shall cooperate with the Council and also follow the instructions given by the Council in relation to the procedures for the performance of expertise in accordance with the Procedure and the expertise contract.

7. The expert is entitled to evaluate only the following number of pages according to Paragraph 43 of the Procedure:

7.1. 15 pages if the project proposal concerns the objective specified in Sub-clauses 6.1.2, 6.4, 6.5.1 or 6.6.2 of the Cabinet Order, in addition examining up to three pages if certifications of social partners, recommendation letters on cooperation and other documents are enclosed;

7.2. 20 pages if the project proposal concerns the objective specified in Sub-clauses 6.1.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5.2 or 6.6.1 of the Cabinet Order, in addition examining up to three pages if certifications of social partners, recommendation letters on cooperation and other documents are enclosed;

2.1. Individual review of the project proposal

8. The expert shall complete and approve the individual expert review of the project proposal (hereinafter referred to as — the individual review), which is formed in accordance with Annex 8 to the Procedure "Form of the Individual/Consolidated Expert Review of the Project Proposal" in the Information System within two calendar weeks of the conclusion of the expertise contract and date of receiving an access to the project proposal and all necessary information, unless another term is specified in the expertise contract.

9. The expert shall evaluate each criterion in the individual review and provide evaluation in points, taking into account the considerations specified in Clause 13 of the Methodology.

10. The criteria shall be evaluated by the expert with the score of 1 to 5 points for each criterion where:

10.1 Excellent – 5 points (excellent project proposal which conforms to the highest requirements of the relevant science sector or even exceeds the requirements for the criterion, any deficiency in the project proposal is insignificant);

10.2 Good – 4 points (good project proposal which conforms to the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion; however, there are certain deficiencies);

10.3 Satisfactory – 3 points (satisfactory project proposal which in general conforms to the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion, there are certain deficiencies which will hinder the project implementation and achievement of high results);

10.4 Weak – 2 points (weak project proposal, partial or only general conformity with the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion, presence of deficiencies which hinder successful implementation of the project and achievement of goals);

10.5 Unsatisfactory – 1 point (unsatisfactory project proposal which does not meet the requirements of the relevant science sector for the criterion and the provided information is insufficient for providing evaluation for the criterion and also there are significant deficiencies which cast doubt over the implementation of the project and achievement of goals);

10.6 if the evaluation of the project proposal for the relevant criterion exceeds the requirements of the previous lowest score evaluation, but does not fully meet the requirements of the next highest score evaluation, the evaluation may be expressed by awarding half a point, i.e. 0.5.

11. The expert shall provide a reasoned justification for the evaluation in points of each scientific criterion. The expert shall explain in the justification the number of points given by applying his/her professional qualifications and experience in the respective science sector.

12. The Council shall, within three calendar days of the receipt of the individual review of the project proposal from the expert, evaluate the conformity of the respective individual review with the considerations referred to in Paragraphs 27, 28, and 29 of Cabinet Regulation, and also with the Methodology and, if necessary, shall return the respective review to the expert for adjustment/redrafting/improvement thereof in such case providing duly justified reasons for the return thereof. In case of such return, the expert shall, within three calendar days of the receipt of the notification of the Council via electronic mail in relation to the return of the review which was sent via electronic mail, adjust, redraft and approve the individual review in the Information System.

13. The expert shall complete the individual review in the Information System (see Annex 8 to the Procedure "Form of the Individual/Consolidated Expert Review of the Project Proposal") in accordance with the following criteria and considerations:

Individual/consolidated expert review of the project proposal		
Project title: Expert(-s):		
1.	**Criterion: Scientific quality of the project**	Maximum score: 5 points

1.1.	Consideration: the scientific quality, credibility, and novelty of the research	*The expert should justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion.* *1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Section 1 "Scientific Excellence" and also in Subsection 2.6 "Scientific Results and Provision of the Availability Thereof" and in Subsection 3.1 "Project Applicant and Scientific Team" of the description of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion,* ***the project proposal should be taken into account as a whole.*** *2. The scientific excellence of the project, including the selected research strategy and methodological solutions, the ability to create new knowledge or technological conclusions, as well as the ability to establish and develop the interdisciplinary and inclusive internationally competitive team of scientists who use in the scientific activity the research methods and technologies acknowledged among the world's scientists, should be evaluated according to the specific nature of the relevant science sector or sectors and the specific nature of the project, as well as the specific nature of the project applicant and project cooperation partners (if any).* *3. Thematic and horizontal objectives of the programme, results, their implementation possibilities should be taken into account in the evaluation, as well as it should be assessed whether the project proposal is adequate in order to reach the overarching goal and goals of the programme according to the thematic area of the project.* *4. The total potential of the project should be evaluated to develop the knowledge base in social sciences and humanities aimed at developing national research and innovation systems within which the current problems of the public are addressed.*
1.2	Consideration: scientific quality of the selected research strategy and methodological solutions, as well as compliance for the achievement of the setgoals	
1.3	Consideration: ability of the project to create new knowledge or technological conclusions	
1.4	Consideration: contribution of cooperation partners (if any), their scientific capacity, planned cooperation quality.	
2.	**Criterion: Impact of project results**	Maximum score: 5 points
2.1	Consideration: expected transfer of the acquired knowledge and skills in further activity and the development of scientific capacity	*The expert should justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion. .* *1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Section 2 "Impact" of the description of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion,* ***the project proposal should be taken into account as a whole.*** *2. Results and estimated impact thereof, including the planned transfer of results in further activities and development of the scientific capacity, further research development possibilities should be evaluated in accordance with the specific nature of the relevant*
2.2	Consideration: research development possibilities, including investment in drafting new projects for submission in the calls for projects of the European Union framework programmes for research and innovation and other research and innovation support programmes and technology initiatives	

2.3	Consideration: the research will create significant knowledge or policy recommendations and solutions to achieve programme's goals and for the relevant sector, foster economic and societal development, as well as of policy recommendations and solutions to achieve the objectives of the programme, the relevant sector, economic and social development	*science sector or sectors and the specific nature of the project, as well as the specific nature of the project applicant's institution and project cooperation partners (if any), as well as the specific objectives of the programme.* *3. The expert should evaluate the project impact on the research community, by developing the resources necessary for the research, identifying any previous research, instruments and databases of other institutions and other countries, as well as involving young scientists. It should be evaluated how effectively the students and new scientists are involved, by comparing the total workload of the staff of scientific team, including the plan should be evaluated for the student involvement and the increase of capacity of scientific team within the project. Information on the workload of the scientific team of the project, including the students, is available in Part A "General information", Section 3 "Project budget" and Sub-section 2.1 of the description of the project proposal. It should be evaluated how effectively the scientists from the Latvian diaspora and university students are involved in the project.* *4. The project impact on learners at all levels in the educational process should be evaluated (how and whether it is planned to develop digital learning content and innovative pedagogical methods and to provide internships and job opportunities, as well as the use of scientific results of the project in general and higher education learning processes). Information about this criterion can be found in Subsection 2.3 of the description of the project proposal.* *5. Sustainability of the project results is evaluated in conjunction with the intended scientific publications and distribution of project results in the scientific society. Information about the dissemination of the project results can be found in Subsection 2.6 "Scientific Results of the Project and Provision of Availability Thereof" of the description of the project proposal. Special attention should be paid to the provision of result sustainability, by ensuring public access to research results, including by providing free access to scientific publications and depositing newly acquired research data in research data repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles — findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable.* *6. It should be evaluated which are the plans described in the project proposal for identification of the involved parties, for application of cooperation forms and for transfer of knowledge acquired in the project, especially cooperating with the sectoral policy makers and implementers, proactively facilitating the changes in the policy). Information about this criterion can be found in Subsection 2.4 of the description of the project proposal.*
2.4	Consideration: sustainability of the acquired knowledge and a qualitative plan for the dissemination thereof, including the planned scientific publications and informing society	
2.5	Consideration: research implementation promotes strengthening of the scientific capacities of the scientific personnel of the research, including students	

		7. The impact on the economic sectors competent for the purpose of the project (including publishing, mass media and ICT sectors) should be evaluated, by cooperating with the organizations and specialists of the relevant economic sectors; Information about this criterion can be found in Subsection 2.2 of the description of the project proposal. *8. The potential of the project to inform the public about the project results should be taken into account, ensuring knowledge transfer and awareness of the role and contribution of research to the public, promoting involvement in the research process (e.g. through social science initiatives) and developing and disseminating resources useful to the public, including informative popular science articles on the performed research, their results and public benefits (in the description of the project proposal in Subsection 2.5).* *The expert should also evaluate the possibilities to implement the results achievable in the project according to Paragraph 10 of the Procedure, the results of Paragraph 8 of the Cabinet Regulation are as follows:* *8.1 developed or adapted innovative tools and solutions meeting the needs of the end-user target groups;* *8.2 promoted changes in the operational policy (e.g. by consulting the sectoral policy makers, preparing recommendations and guidelines);* *8.3 established interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary (with partners outside the academic environment) consortia, involvement in international cooperation networks and consortia, project proposals in the European Union and other international programs;* *8.4 developed human capital, involving young and diaspora scientists in research, providing internship and work opportunities for students and candidates for doctoral degrees, as well as developing master's and doctoral study modules related to the programme;* *8.5 scientific monographs and original scientific articles in the journals or conference symposia included in Web of Science or SCOPUS (A or B) databases;* *8.6 informative popular science articles on the conducted research, its results and benefits to the public.*
3.	**Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and provision**	Maximum score: 5 points
3.1	Consideration: quality of the research work plan and its conformity with the goal brought forward. The intended resources are adequate and sufficient for the achievement of the goal. It is intended to ensure efficient use of resources in the research. The	*The expert should justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criterion.* *1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Section 3 "Implementation" of the description of the project proposal and Part C*

	planned work stages and objectives are clearly defined, appropriate and credible	*"Curriculum Vitae" of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion, the project proposal should be taken into account as a whole.* *2. The project feasibility, including the prepared work plan of the research, intended project management and quality management thereof, intended resources, available infrastructure should be evaluated in accordance with the specific nature of the relevant science sector or sectors and the specific nature of the project and also the specific nature of the project applicant and project cooperation partners (if any).* *3. The expert should evaluate the compliance of the scientific qualification and experience of the principal investigator and the lead participant of the project with the achievement of the project goals and fulfilment of the intended objectives on the basis of the submitted Curriculum Vitae in Part C "Curriculum Vitae" of the project proposal (Curriculum Vitae is submitted by the principal investigator and lead participants only).* *The planned project implementation should be evaluated in conjunction with the completed Section 3 "Project Budget" of Part A of the project proposal which provides for the costs for the remuneration of the scientific team of the project, material supplies and technical provisions, official travelling and publicity costs.* *It should be considered that the duration of implementation of one project is 36 months.*
3.2	Consideration: scientific qualification of the principal investigator and lead participants of the project on the basis of the submitted curriculum vitae (CV)	
3.3	Consideration: project quality management envisaged. Management organisation enables following the progress of carrying out the research. Potential risks have been evaluated and a plan for the prevention thereof or minimisation of the negative impact thereof has been developed	
3.4	Consideration: there is infrastructure necessary for conducting the research and the access to other research infrastructure of cooperation partners (if applicable)	
3.5	Consideration: institution which implements the research and its cooperation partners (if applicable) have the necessary experiencefor the project implementation	

2.1 Expert panels

14. After receiving the individual reviews of project proposals in the Information System, within five working days, in compliance with Paragraph 41 of the Procedure, the experts who are responsible for the preparation of the consolidated expert reviews participate in one of five panels (hereinafter referred to as — the expert panel):

14.1 panel within competence of which falls the objective under Sub-clause 6.1 of the Cabinet Order;

14.2 panel within competence of which falls the objective under Sub-clause 6.2 of the Cabinet Order;

14.3 panel within competence of which falls the objective under Sub-clause 6.3 of the Cabinet Order;

14.4 panel within competence of which falls the objective under Sub-clause 6.4 of the Cabinet Order;

14.5 panel within competence of which fall the objectives under Sub-clauses 6.5 and 6.6 of the Cabinet Order;

15. Before organizing an expert panel, the Council shall re-verify that each expert in the expert panel does not have a conflict of interest with the project applicants, principal investigators and lead participants submitted in the project proposals to be considered in the respective expert panel.

16. In order to ensure the successful course of expert panel, the Council shall designate one expert as a chair in each panel. It shall be determined on the basis of his/her scientific qualifications,

professional and managerial experience in order to organize the expert panel and lead an advisory discussion between the experts, with a view to providing experts with a comprehensive view of the situation concerning project proposals to be examined in the respective expert panel, the capacity of the project applicant and the scientific team.

17. The expert panel shall take place on-line via video conference (real-time video and audio transmission). The panel shall be fixed in a video recording, and it shall be recorded by the person designated by the Council.

2.2 Consolidated review of the project proposal

18. After the expert panel, the expert who is responsible for consolidating all individual expert reviews of the respective project proposal, preparing the consolidated expert review in accordance with Annex 8 to the Procedure "Form of the Individual/Consolidated Expert Review of the Project Proposal" and following the conditions and individual reviews specified in Clauses 8-14 of the Methodology, within three calendar days of the relevant date of the panel, a consolidated review agreed in accordance with Clause 19 of the Methodology shall be prepared and submitted to the Information System.

19. All experts of the respective project proposal shall agree on the consolidated review referred to in Clause 18 of the Methodology in the Information System within three calendar days of the moment when the expert who is responsible for consolidating all individual expert reviews has submitted it to the Information System.

20. The consolidated expert review of the project proposal is an agreement between all experts on the final evaluation of the project proposal, thereby the expert who prepares the consolidated review of the project proposal shall consult other experts regarding the following:

20.1 score in points for each criterion;

20.2 justification of scores in points for each criterion summarized from all justifications provided in the individual expert reviews.

21. The Council shall, within three working days, evaluate the compliance of the consolidated review with the Methodology and approve it in the Information System. If the consolidated review is not compliant or it does not contain sufficient arguments of the application regarding the provided review with respect to the indicated deficiencies and shortages of the project proposal, it shall be returned to the expert who is responsible for consolidating all individual evaluations, for its adjustment/improvement.

22. The expert responsible for consolidating all individual reviews, in case of return of the consolidated review of the project proposal, within three working days from the day of receipt of the notification of the return of the Information System, clarify/improve the consolidated review of the project proposal and submit it to the other experts in accordance with Clause 19 of the Methodology. If the experts cannot agree on the consolidated expert review due to their different views, the experts shall inform the Council, the Council shall engage one more expert according to Paragraph 42 of the Procedure.

3. Scientific expertise of the project interim and final scientific report

23. Within one month from the project mid-term, i.e. 18 months of the project commencement date, the project applicant shall complete and submit the project interim scientific report (hereinafter referred to as — the interim report), while within one month of the end of project implementation the project applicant shall complete and submit the project final scientific report (hereinafter referred to as — the final report). The Council shall provide the scientific expertise to the interim reports and

final reports (hereinafter together referred to as — the interim/final report), to be performed by at least two experts.

24. The Council shall provide each expert with access to the interim report and/or final report of the respective project and the proposal of the same project. In the event of the review of the final report, the Council shall additionally provide the expert with access to the interim report of the same project. Before receiving the access to the above reports in the Information System, the expert shall certify that he/she has no conflict of interest and shall also undertake to conform to the confidentiality requirements by signing and sending by e-mail the expert certification to the Council.

3.1 Individual review of the project interim and final scientific report

25. Within two weeks from the conclusion of the expertise contract with the Council, the expert shall perform the individual review of the project interim scientific report or the project final scientific report (hereinafter together referred to as — the project interim/final scientific report) by completing and validating Annex 10 to the Procedure "Form of the Individual/Consolidated Review of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report" in the Information System.

26. The expert shall provide one of the following two types of reviews for the project interim scientific report:

26.1 to continue the project;

26.2 to not continue the project;

27. The expert shall provide one of the following two types of reviews for the final scientific report of the project:

27.1 the project goal is reached;

27.2 the project goal is not reached;

28. The expert shall evaluate the project interim scientific report / final scientific report according to the following criteria:

Individual/consolidated review of the project interim/final scientific report	
Project title: Expert(-s):	
1.	**Criterion: Scientific quality of the project**
	The expert should evaluate how the scientific team of the project has managed to achieve the objectives laid down in the project proposal until the mid-term stage /end of the project. The primary focus is on Section 1 "Scientific Excellence" of the project interim/final scientific report, while also taking into account the project interim/final scientific report in general and the project proposal. Here, the expert should give his/her comment and suggestions to completely achieve the project goal and to complete the objectives of a higher scientific quality, or regarding research opportunities after the end of the respective project to achieve the scientific excellence. When giving comments, the programme objective, programme horizontal tasks and results should be taken into account, as well as it should be assessed whether the project leads to the achievement of the overarching goal and goals of the programme. *The expert should evaluate whether the results of the scientific team of the project in a respective period of time show its high research capacity, and whether the described results duly develop the knowledge base in social sciences and humanities to solve the current problems of the public.*
2.	**Criterion: Impact of project results**

	The expert should evaluate how the scientific team of the project has managed to achieve the objectives laid down in the project proposal until the mid-term stage / end of the project. The primary focus is on Section 2 "Impact" of the project interim/final scientific report, while also taking into account the project interim/final scientific report in general and the project proposal. In this section, the expert should give his/her comment and suggestions to more completely reach the intended impact and to ensure the dissemination of the acquired knowledge in the scientific society and the communication with the public in general, or activities after the end of respective project. *The expert should evaluate whether the transfer of results in further activities planned in the project proposal, and development of scientific capacity and possibilities of further development of research are implemented (established consortiums, involvement in the international cooperation networks and consortiums, project proposals to the international programmes of the European Union and others) and whether they comply with the programme objectives and goals. The expert should evaluate whether the scientific team of the project has become more internationally competitive and whether its capacity has increased.* *The expert should also assess the cooperation with public institutions and other partners (e.g. provision of recommendations, participation in the policy planning, etc.).* *The expert should evaluate the impact on the research community planned in the project proposal, by developing the resources necessary for the research, identifying any previous research, instruments and databases of other institutions and other countries, as well as engaging new scientists.* *The expert should evaluate and give his/her comment on how the plan is performed for the provision of result sustainability, by ensuring public access to research results, including by providing free access to scientific publications and depositing newly acquired research data in research data repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles — findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable.* *The expert should also evaluate the measures of the project implementer for increasing the capacity of students and new scientists, including the impact of project results on learners in the educational process, by developing digital learning content and innovative pedagogical methods and by providing the use of scientific results of the project in general and higher education learning processes, as well as the execution of the plan on the student involvement or its progress.* *The expert should evaluate and give his/her comment whether the impact on the economic sectors competent for the purpose of the project (including publishing, mass media and ICT sectors) planned in the project proposal, by cooperating with the organizations and specialists of the relevant economic sectors, is reached (or how it is being worked on), or provide recommendations for more efficient implementation.* *The expert should evaluate and give his/her recommendations on the public awareness activities planned in the project proposals, their performance, as well as shall evaluate the project performance in raising awareness of the role and contribution of research to the public, promoting involvement in the research process (e.g. through social science initiatives) and developing and disseminating resources useful to the public, including informative popular science articles on the performed research.*
3.	**Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and provision**
	The expert should evaluate how the scientific team of the project has managed to achieve the objectives laid down in the project proposal until the mid-term stage / end of the project. The primary focus is on Section3 "Implementation" of the project interim/final scientific report, while also taking into account the project mid-term/final scientific report in general and the project proposal. In this section, the expert should give his/her comment and suggestions for correction of the agenda or research opportunities after the end of the respective project. *The expert should evaluate whether the project management has been successful, including by taking into account the overall progress of the project implementation. It should be also*

	evaluated whether the risk plan provided for in Subsection 3.3 "Project Management and Risk Plan" of Part B of the project proposal has been achieved in cases where the risks materialised and whether the solutions thereof were credible. *In addition, the expert should evaluate and indicate whether students and candidates for doctoral degrees are sufficiently involved in the implementation of the project up to the specified stage, as well as should evaluate the involvement of Latvian diaspora scientists and university students in the implementation of the project.*

3.2 Consolidated review of the project interim and final scientific report

29. Once all the experts carrying out the scientific expertise of the project interim/final scientific report have completed and approved their individual review of the project interim/final scientific report in the Information System, the Council shall provide all experts with access to the individual review completed by other experts and disclose the identity of other experts to each expert.

30. One of the experts in the Information System shall complete the consolidated review of the project interim/final report of the project in accordance with Annex 10 to the Procedure "Form of Individual/Consolidated Review of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report", observing the conditions specified in Clauses 25-28 of the Methodology, all experts shall, by mutual agreement, approve the draft consolidated review of the project interim/final scientific report in the Information System within one calendar week of the submission by one expert to other experts.

31. In the consolidated review of the project interim/final report, the experts shall agree on one evaluation for the project interim/final scientific report according to Clauses 26 and 27 of the Methodology, by summarizing the comments provided in the individual reviews of the project interim/final report.

3.3. Evaluation of the goal of the final scientific report of the project

32. In case when the consolidated evaluation of the final scientific report of the project indicates that "Project goal is not reached", the Council shall contact by e-mail the respective experts who evaluated the final scientific report of the project, and shall ask them to provide their evaluation on the achievement of the project proposal goal expressed as a percentage (hereinafter referred to as — the goal evaluation), taking into account the following considerations:

32.1 the achievement of the goals/objectives planned in the project proposal (how many goals and/or objectives are achieved). In case when the goals and objectives in the project proposal are expressed with other words, the experts shall evaluate the units which by their nature correspond to the words "goal" and "objective";

32.2 performance of the work packages planned in the project proposal (how many work packages are performed of the total number);

32.3 compliance of the results planned in the project proposal (how many of the planned results comply) with the project objectives which are implemented within the programme.

33. If it is possible to clearly state the financial expenses related to the failure to achieve the goal of the project proposal or particular planned results, it shall be expressly indicated in the goal evaluation for the Council to be able to provide the evaluation of the project cost-effectiveness.