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# Introduction

The Expert Review Methodology (hereinafter – the Methodology) has been developed in accordance with the Cabinet Regulation of 4 September 2018 No. 560 "Procedures Regarding Implementation of National Research Programme Projects" (hereinafter – the Cabinet Regulation) and in compliance with the Cabinet Regulation of 16 July 2024 No. 577 "On the National Research Programme "Analysis of the Suitability of Artificial Intelligence Methods for European Union Funds Projects" for the years 2024 and 2025" (hereinafter – the Cabinet Order) and the Regulations for the open call for proposals for the National Research Programme "Analysis of the Suitability of Artificial Intelligence Methods for European Union Funds Projects" (hereinafter referred to as the Regulations), approved by the Commission for Implementation and Supervision of the National Research Programme "Analysis of the Suitability of Artificial Intelligence Methods for European Union Funds Projects" (hereinafter – the Commission) on\_\_\_ 2024.

The Methodology has been developed for the experts who carry out the scientific assessment of the project applications for the tender and the final scientific report.

According to Section 35, Paragraph one of the Law on Scientific Activity, State research programmes are State commissions 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.

As a government order, the National Research Programme “Analysis of the Suitability of Artificial Intelligence Methods for European Union Funds Projects” (hereinafter referred to as the Programme) is a policy implementation mechanism that identifies and researches issues of importance for Latvia’s sustainability and development, which need to be the focus of the work of Latvian scientific institutions, and identifies relevant scientific research tasks to address them. In view of the above, the programme creates favourable conditions for achieving sustainable development goals of Latvia.

Involvement of the best group of scientists within which scientists representing the following fields will cooperate for the achievement of the project is provided for the implementation of the programme.

1 Information and communication technologies (ICT);

2 Intelligent materials, technologies and engineering systems;

3 Smart specialisation and innovation management;

4 Digital economics.

The Programme was established by the Central Finance and Contracting Agency, a subordinate body of the Ministry of Finance, and is financed by the Ministry of Finance (hereinafter – the Ministry). The total State budget funding allocated for the implementation of the Programme is *EUR* 110,000 (one hundred and ten thousand *euro*) (hereinafter referred to as the total funding of the tender), of which *EUR* 7,700 (seven thousand seven hundred *euro*) is earmarked for the implementation of the measures set out in Paragraph 37 of the Cabinet Regulation, up to a maximum of seven per cent. Duration for the implementation of the programme: 2024 to 2025.

Within the framework of the open call for proposals of the National Research Programme "Analysis of the Suitability of Artificial Intelligence Methods for European Union Funds Projects" (hereinafter – the tender) it is planned to finance 1 (one) project with a maximum funding of *EUR* 102,300.

In accordance with the Cabinet Order:

The main objective of the programme is to introduce artificial intelligence in the field of monitoring of EU funds projects, thereby streamlining the processes of monitoring project procurement and at the same time ensuring faster reimbursement of EU funds to project promoters.

The aim of the programme is to investigate the possibilities of adapting generative artificial intelligence for text analysis and answer generation in Latvian in procurement documentation for European Union projects.

Programme tasks:

1 testing generative artificial intelligence solutions in the analysis of procurement documents for European Union projects;

2 to assess the technological readiness and suitability of generative artificial intelligence solutions for text analysis and answer generation in Latvian in the monitoring processes of European Union funds projects;

3 measure and compare the quality of different generative artificial intelligence solutions.

A project applicant shall submit the project application covering all tasks set out in Paragraph 6 of the Cabinet Order.

The project must achieve all the horizontal objectives set out in Paragraph 7 of the Cabinet Order and the results set out in Paragraph 8 of the Cabinet Order.

# 1 Terms Used

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Term** | **Definition** |
| **1** | **Scientific group** | Scientific staff and scientific technical staff (persons performing support functions for the scientific activity (e.g. planning, economic, financial, scientific and technical information unit staff, special and scientific and technical library staff, patent service specialists, archivists)) involved in the implementation of the project. The scientific group shall be composed of the project manager, the project PIs (if required) and the project implementers |
| **2** | **Scientific staff** | Leading researchers, researchers, scientific assistants, academic staff[[1]](#footnote-1) and students. |
| **3** | **Project applicant** | A scientific institution registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia or a higher education institution that meets the definition of a research organisation[[2]](#footnote-2). The applicant is responsible for the implementation of the project and the achievement of the overall project results |
| **4** | **Project cooperation partner - scientific institution** | A scientific institution registered in the Register of Scientific Institutions of the Republic of Latvia or a higher education institution that meets the definition of a research organisation. Applicant is responsible for the implementation of the project and the achievement of the overall project results |
| **5** | **Project cooperation partner - public institution** | A public body which is required to carry out scientific activities by an external legal enactment, its regulations or its articles of association, and is engaged in the implementation of the project with property, intellectual property, funding or human resources in its possession or ownership |
| **6** | **Project manager** | A scientist who manages the project and ensures its implementation. The project manager plans and supervises the execution of the project tasks, is responsible for the activities of his/her own and those of other persons involved in the project in accordance with the tasks set out in the project, scientific ethical norms, timely preparation and submission of documentation describing the scientific progress of the project in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Cabinet Regulation.  The project manager is registered in the National Scientific Activity Information System (hereinafter - information system). |
| **7** | **Principal investigators** | The scientists implementing the project and being responsible for the execution of its parts. |
| **8** | **Project implementers** | Members of the scientific group who carry out individual scientific tasks in the implementation of the project and are responsible for carrying out relevant parts of it. |
| **9** | **Students of the institution of higher education** | A student involved in the project scientific group is a bachelor student, a professional student, a master student, a medical resident and a PhD student.[[3]](#footnote-3) Students of the institution of higher education must be involved in the project according to the provisions of Paragraphs 22-25 of the Regulations. |
| **10** | **Project contact person** | A natural person who is registered in the information system, fills in information on the project application, uploads its annexes, as well as, where necessary, maintains contact with the staff of the Latvian Council of Science (the project contact person may also be the Project Manager) and the staff of the Ministry of Education and Science during the project submission and implementation. The project applicant indicates the project contact person in Chapter 1 “General information” of Part A of the project application. If the project has cooperation partners, their contact persons are likewise indicated. |

# 2 Scientific examination of the project application

1 The scientific assessment process of all the project applications submitted under the tender is organised by the Council.

2 If the project application fulfils the criteria for administrative evaluation, the Council shall, on the basis of Paragraph 37 of the Regulations, involve two or more suitably qualified experts to carry out the scientific expert examination of the project application (hereinafter – the scientific examination).

3 Before accessing the project application in the information system, the expert:

3.1 declares that he/she has no conflict of interest and undertakes to respect the requirements of confidentiality by signing and sending to the Council, by electronic mail, Annex 5 to the Regulations, “Declaration of absence of conflict of interest and maintenance of confidentiality” (the expert's declaration);

3.2 enters into a contract with the council - Annex 6 to the Regulation, “Service contract for scientific evaluation” (the service contract).

4 The Council shall, upon receipt of the expert’s certification and the conclusion of the expert assessment contract, give the expert access to the project application and to all the necessary information in the information system to carry out an appropriate assessment of the project application.

5 The expert shall assess the project application by applying his or her competence in the scientific assessment of projects and experience in the relevant scientific field and by justifying his or her rating with scientific evidence.

6 The expert cooperates with the Council during the scientific examination and complies with the instructions given by the Council pertaining to the performance of the examination in accordance with the Regulations and the service contract.

7 According to Paragraph 45 of the Regulation, the expert is only entitled to evaluate 20 pages of a project application, with up to three additional pages, if acknowledgements of the interested institutions, letters of recommendation on cooperation and other documents are attached.

**2.1 Individual assessment of the project application**

8 In the information system, the expert completes and approves the individual evaluation of the project application (hereinafter – the individual evaluation), prepared in accordance with Annex 8 “Project application examination individual/consolidated assessment form” to the Regulations within two calendar weeks from the date of conclusion of the service contract and receipt of access to the project application and all necessary information unless a different deadline is specified in the expert contract.

9 In the individual assessment, the expert shall evaluate each criterion and provide a score taking into account the considerations set out in Paragraph 13 of the methodology.

10 The expert evaluates the criteria and assigns a score from 1 to 5 for each criterion, where:

10.1 With distinction – 5 points (excellent project proposal, meets or exceeds the highest standards in the relevant scientific field, any shortcomings in the project proposal are minor);

10.2 Good – 4 points (good project proposal, fulfils the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, but there are some shortcomings);

10.3 Satisfactory – 3 points (satisfactory project application, generally fulfils the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, with some shortcomings that will make it difficult to implement the project and achieve high results);

10.4 Weak – 2 points (weak project proposal, partial or only general compliance with the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, identifiable shortcomings that make it difficult to successfully implement the project and achieve its objectives);

10.5 Unsatisfactory – 1 point (unsatisfactory project application, does not meet the requirements of the relevant scientific field for the criterion, and the information provided is insufficient for the assessment under the criterion, and there are significant shortcomings that make the implementation of the project and the achievement of the objectives questionable);

10.6 if the project application's score in a given criterion exceeds the requirements of the previous lowest score but does not fully meet the requirements of the next highest score, the score may also be supplemented by a half point, i.e. 0.5.

11 For each criterion, the expert provides a scientifically reasoned justification, using his/her expertise in scientific evaluation of projects and experience in the relevant scientific field. The expert explains in the justification the mark awarded, using his/her professional qualifications and experience in the relevant scientific field.

12 Within three calendar days from the date of receipt of the individual assessment, the Council shall assess, without intervention in the expert’s competence, the compliance of the individual assessment with the considerations referred to in Paragraphs 27, 28 and 29 of the Cabinet Regulation, as well as with the Methodology, where necessary, returning the individual assessment to the expert for specification/revision/improvement, justifying the reasons for the return. In the event of such a return, the expert shall update, revise and validate the individual assessment in the information system within three days of the date of receipt of the notification by the Council, sent by e-mail, of the return of the individual assessment of the expert.

13 The expert complete the individual assessment in the information system (see Annex 7 “Project application examination individual/consolidated assessment form” to the Regulation) according to the following criteria and considerations:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual/consolidated examination of the project application** | | | |
| Project title:  Expert(s): | | | |
| **1** | **Criterion: Scientific quality of the project** | | Maximum 5 points |
| **1.1** | Consideration: scientific quality, reliability, and novelty of the research | *The expert shall justify the score given by taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion as a whole and of each criterion consideration.*  *1 Specific information for the criterion is given in Chapter 1 “Scientific excellence” of the project application, as well as in Sub-chapters 2.5”Scientific results of the project and ensuring their availability” and 3.1 “Proposer and scientific team”, but it is the project application as a whole that should be taken into account when assessing the criterion.*  *2 The scientific excellence of the project, including the chosen research strategy and methodological solutions, the ability to generate new knowledge or technological insights, as well as the ability to build and develop an interdisciplinary and inclusive team of internationally competitive scientists using research methods and technologies that are recognised among scientists worldwide, shall be assessed according to the specificities of the relevant scientific field or fields and the project, as well as the specificities of the institutions of the applicant and the project cooperation partners (if any).*  *3 The evaluation takes into account:*  *1) the programme's overarching objectives and aims (in line with Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Cabinet Order);*  *2) tasks (in accordance with Paragraph 6 of the Cabinet Order);*  *3) horizontal tasks of the programme, results to be achieved (in accordance with Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Cabinet Order) and implementation possibilities thereof;*  *4) assess whether the project application is adequate to achieve the overarching objective and aims of the Programme, in accordance with the thematic area of the project and the expected deadline for implementation.*  *5) Assess the overall potential of the project to develop the knowledge base for implementation of the artificial intellection in the field of monitoring European Union Funds projects to develop national research and innovation systems that address societal challenges.* | |
| **1.2** | Consideration: scientific quality of the chosen research strategy and methodological approaches, as well as relevance for achievement of set objectives and tasks |
| **1.3** | Consideration: capacity of the project to generate new knowledge or technological insights |
| **1.4** | Consideration: contribution of the cooperation partners (if any), their scientific capacity, the quality of the cooperation envisaged |
| **2** | **Criterion: Impact of project results** | | Maximum 5 points |
| **2.1** | expected transfer of acquired knowledge and skills to further activities and scientific capacity development | *The expert shall justify the mark given by taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion as a whole and of each criterion consideration. Criterion-specific information is given in Chapter 2 “Impact” of the project application, but when assessing the criterion, the project application must be taken into account as a whole.*  *The results and their expected impact, including the planned transfer of results into further activities and scientific capacity development, the possibilities for further development of research shall be assessed according to the specificities of the scientific field or fields concerned and of the project, as well as the specificities of the institution of the applicant and the specificities of the institutions of the project cooperation partners (if any).*  *The expert shall assess how effectively the project engages students and young scientists in relation to the overall workload of the scientific group, including a plan for engaging students and building the capacity of the scientific group within the framework of the project. Information on the workload of the project scientific group, including students, can be found in Chapter 3 “Budget” of Part A “General Information” of the project application.*  *Sustainability of the project results is assessed in relation to the expected scientific publications and the dissemination of the project results in scientific conferences. Information on the dissemination of the project results can be found in the project application description, subsection 2.5 "Scientific results of the project and making them accessible". Particular attention should be paid to ensuring the sustainability of results, following the principles of Open Access, Open Data, FAIR - findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable - as well as to the choice of the project applicant for data deposition.*  *The potential of the project to raise public awareness of the project results and to increase the socio-economic impact of the project results should be taken into account (sub-chapters 2.2-2.5 of description of the project application). Assesses whether the plans described in the project application for applying and transferring the results of the research to end-users are adequate and feasible. Assess cooperation of the project applicant with other scientific institutions as well as state institutions, other organisations.*  *The expert assesses the impact of the project taking into account also the provisions of the Cabinet Order, i.e:*  *The aim of the programme is to investigate the possibilities of adapting generative artificial intelligence for text analysis and answer generation in Latvian in procurement documentation for European Union projects.*  *Programme tasks:*  *1 testing generative artificial intelligence solutions in the analysis of procurement documents for European Union projects;*  *2 to assess the technological readiness and suitability of generative artificial intelligence solutions for text analysis and answer generation in Latvian in the monitoring processes of European Union funds projects;*  *3 measure and compare the quality of different generative artificial intelligence solutions.* | |
| **2.2** | opportunities for research development, including contributions to the preparation of new projects for submission to competitions under the European Union Framework Programmes for Research and Innovation Horizon Europe and other research and innovation support programmes and technology initiatives |
| **2.3** | the research will lead to knowledge or policy recommendations and solutions relevant to the objectives of the Programme, the sector concerned, the economy and society |
| **2.4** | sustainability of the knowledge generated and a qualitative dissemination plan, including scientific publications and public outreach |
| **2.5** | the implementation of the study contributes to strengthening the scientific capacities of the research staff, including students |
| **3** | **Criterion: Possibilities and provision of project implementation** | | Maximum 5 points |
| **3.1** | quality of the research activity plan and its relevance to the objective. The resources provided are adequate and sufficient to achieve the objective. The research aims to ensure efficient use of resources. The planned work steps and tasks are clearly defined, relevant and reliable | *The expert justifies the score given by taking into account fulfillment of the criterion as a whole and its considerations. Specific information for the criterion is given in Chapter 3 “Implementation” of the project application and in Part C “Curriculum Vitae” of the project application, but the assessment of the criterion must take into account the project application as a whole.*  *Feasibility of the project, including the research work plan prepared, the envisaged management and quality control of the research, information provided on the data management plan, the resources envisaged, available infrastructure, shall be assessed according to the specificities of the sector or sectors of the science concerned and of the project, as well as the specificities of the applicant and the collaborating partners (if any).*  *The expert shall assess the relevance of the scientific qualifications and experience of the project manager and the principal investigators to the achievement of the project objectives and the performance of the tasks envisaged on the basis of the curriculum vitae submitted in Part C “Curriculum Vitae” of the project application.*  *The planned implementation of the project is assessed in relation to the completed project application in Part A "General information", Chapter 3 "Budget", which foresees the costs of the project team’s salary, material and technical support, travel and publication costs.* | |
| **3.2** | scientific qualifications of the project manager and of the key project implementers, based on the curriculum vitae submitted |
| **3.3** | project quality management is foreseen. The management organisation allows one to follow the progress of the study. Potential risks have been assessed and a plan developed to avoid or mitigate them |
| **3.4** | Existence of the research infrastructure needed to carry out the study and access to other research infrastructure of the collaborating partners (if applicable) |
| **3.5** | The institution carrying out the research and its collaborating partners (if applicable) have the necessary experience to implement the project |
| Expert recommendations for the implementation of the project | | *The expert makes recommendations (if any) to the project promoter to ensure a more successful implementation of the project.* | |
| Potential risks related to the implementation of the project | | *The expert shall indicate the risks (if any) to the implementation of the project and whether they are low, medium or high.* | |

## 2.2 Consolidated assessment of the project application

14 After receipt of the individual expert assessments on all project applications in the Information System, the Council shall, via online video conference (real-time video and audio transmission) organise and implement an expert panel discussion for the experts responsible for the preparation of the consolidated expert assessment of the project applications, setting up an expert panel for all the project applications submitted for the task achievement referred to in Section 6 of the Cabinet Order (hereinafter referred to as – the panel).

15 Within three working days of the end of the panel, the expert responsible for the preparation of the consolidated expert evaluation of the project application concerned, considering the expert's individual evaluations of the project application concerned, completes the consolidated expert evaluation of the project application concerned (the consolidated expert evaluation) in the information system, following Annex 7 “Project application examination individual/consolidated assessment form” to the Regulations, and within three working days, coordinates it with the other experts involved in the examination of the project application concerned, who have individually assessed that project application, and submits it to the information system.

16 If only one project application is submitted for the implementation of the tasks set out in Paragraph 6 of the Programme’s Cabinet Order, the Council shall not organise a panel on that project application. The Council shall ensure for each expert an access to the individual assessment completed by the other expert, and shall reveal to each expert the identity of other experts.

17 One of the experts completes the consolidated assessment in accordance with Annex 7 to the Regulation, “Project application examination individual/consolidated assessment form”, in the information system, following the conditions under clauses 6 to 13 of the methodology. All expert (unless the exception referred to in Paragraph 44 applies), shall validate the consolidated assessment in the information system within two weeks after the validation of the last individual assessment in the information system.

18 The consolidated assessment is the agreement between all experts (unless the exception specified in Paragraph 44 applies), on the final assessment of the project application, so that the expert preparing the consolidated assessment consults other experts on:

18.1 score of each criterion in points;

18.2 scientific justification for the scores of each criterion, compiled from the justifications provided by all the experts in their individual assessments.

19 The council examines the consolidated assessment referred to in clause 17 of the methodology once it has been confirmed in the information system. If the Council (without interfering in the competence of experts) finds any inconsistencies with the methodology or the tender Regulations, it has the right to return the consolidated assessment to the experts for revision and confirmation.

20 In the event of a return of the consolidated assessment, the experts must revise and agree on the consolidated assessment within three working days, validating it in the information system in accordance with clauses 17 to 18 of this methodology.

# 3 Scientific examination of the final scientific report of the project

21 Before accessing the final scientific report of the project in the information system, the expert declares that he/she has no conflict of interest and undertakes to respect the confidentiality requirements by signing and sending the council the expert declaration and by concluding a contract with the council.

22 The Council, upon receipt of the expert declaration, gives the expert access to the final scientific report of the project and to all the information necessary for its assessment.

23 The Council provides each expert with access to the final scientific report and to the application for the same project.

24 The expert shall assess the final scientific report of the project by using his or her competence in scientific assessment of projects and work experience in the relevant field of science and by supporting the assessment with scientific justification.

## 3.1 Individual assessment of the final scientific report of the project

25 Within two weeks from the date of conclusion of the contract with the Council, the expert carries out an individual assessment of the scientific report by completing Annex 10 “Individual/consolidated assessment form for the final scientific report of the project” to the Regulations in the information system and confirming it therein.

26 The expert gives the final scientific report one of two scores:

26.1 the project objective has been achieved;

26.2 the project objective has not been achieved.

27 The expert assesses the final scientific report of the project against the following criteria:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual/consolidated assessment of the final scientific report of the project** | | | |
| Project title:  Expert(s): | | | |
| **1** | **Criterion: Scientific quality of the project** | | |
| *The expert assesses how the project’s scientific group has achieved the objectives of the project application by the moment of delivery of the final report. Basically, Chapter 1 "Scientific excellence” of the final scientific report is taken into account, while linking it to the final scientific report as a whole and to the project application. Here, the expert provides comments and suggestions to fully achieve the project’s objective and perform the tasks to the highest scientific quality, or on research opportunities after the end of the project in order to achieve scientific excellence. The comments shall take into account the programme’s tasks and planned results, as well as assess whether the project is progressing towards the achievement of the programme’s overarching objective and the objectives.*  *The expert assesses whether the performance of the project’s scientific team over the relevant period of time demonstrates its high research capacity and whether the results described are appropriate for the supplementing of the knowledge base of the sector(s) of the science* | | |
| **2** | **Criterion: Impact of project results** | | |
| *The expert assesses how the project’s scientific group has achieved the objectives of the project application by the moment of delivery of the final report. Basically, Chapter 2 “Impact” of the final report is taken into account, while linking it to the final report as a whole and to the project application. In this section, the expert provides comments and suggestions to better achieve the intended impact and ensure the dissemination of the knowledge gained to the scientific community and communication to the public at large, or for post-project activities.*  *The expert assesses whether the project has resulted in introduction of artificial intellect in the field of monitoring the European Union Funds projects, and if the scientific community has become more internationally competitive and capable.*  *The expert shall assess how the project implementer has selected the project’s target groups, whether their opinions have been sought in a quality way and whether the activities have been effective for information of the public. He or she also evaluates cooperation with public institutions and other organisations.*  *The expert assesses and comments on the implementation of the plan to make the project results and scientific knowledge available both in Latvia and internationally (including by publishing results in open access journals and depositing newly generated research data in research data repositories according to the principles of "as open as possible" and FAIR - findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable.*  *The expert also assesses the project implementer's capacity building activities for students and the scientific group, as well as the progress of the student involvement plan.*  *The expert assesses progress towards the programme's tasks:*  *1 testing generative artificial intelligence solutions in the analysis of procurement documents for European Union projects;*  *2 to assess the technological readiness and suitability of generative artificial intelligence solutions for text analysis and answer generation in Latvian in the monitoring processes of European Union funds projects;*  *3 measure and compare the quality of different generative artificial intelligence solutions;*  *including achievement of results set out in Paragraph 8 of the Cabinet Order:*  *1 a prototype of a generative artificial intelligence solution on the market, demonstrating the potential of the methods for testing the procurement of European Union projects;*  *2 policy recommendations for the use of generative artificial intelligence solutions in the monitoring of EU projects.* | | |
| **3** | **Criterion: Possibilities and provision of project implementation** | | |
| *The expert assesses how the project’s scientific team has achieved the planned objectives of the project application by the time of delivery of the project /final report. Basically, Chapter 3 "Implementation” of the final report is taken into account, while linking it to final scientific report as a whole and to the project application as a whole. In this section, the expert provides comments and suggestions for adjustments to the work plan or research opportunities after the end of the project.*  *The expert assesses whether the management of the project has been effective, including taking into account the overall progress of the project. The expert assesses the information provided by the project implementer on the development and maintenance of data management plans. Whether the risk plan stated in the Project Description, sub-chapter 3.3 "Project Management and Risk Plan", has been implemented in cases where the risks materialised, and whether the solutions are credible.*  *In addition, the expert assesses and indicates whether the project has sufficiently involved students and PhD candidates by the specified stage. Students must be involved with a total workload of at least 0.9 FTE* *on average during the implementation of the project.* | | |
|  | | | |
|  | |  | |
| ***Project assessment at the end*** | | | |
| The **project objective has been achieved** in accordance with Clause 31.1 of the Methodology.  *Project objective has been achieved – overall score as a percentage is 85–100% and more.*  **Project objective has not been achieved,**  **percentage** **rating of the target** in accordance with Clauses 31.2 and 31.3 of the methodology.  *The project objective has not been achieved, it does not correspond partially – overall rating as a percentage is 25% – 84%*  *The project objective has not been achieved, it does not correspond at all – overall rating as a percentage is 0% – 24%* | | *The expert provides a target rating as a percentage in the overall rating of the final scientific report of the project according to provisions of Paragraph 31 of the methodology.* |

**3.2** **Consolidated evaluation of the final scientific report of the project**

28 Once the experts have completed and validated their individual evaluation for the final scientific report of the project in the information system, the council provides experts with access to the individual evaluation completed by the other experts, as well as discloses the other experts' identity to each expert.

29 In the information system, one of the experts completes the consolidated evaluation following Annex 10 “Individual/consolidated assessment form for the final scientific report of the project”, having regard to the conditions set out in clauses 2 to 27 of the methodology, and all the experts confirm it in the information system within one week.

30 In the consolidated evaluation, the experts agree on a single score for the final scientific report of the project and summarise the comments made in the individual assessments.

**3.3 Evaluation of the objective of the final scientific report**

31 In the consolidated valuation in the Final Report, the two experts agree on a consolidated percentage valuation, which has the following meaning:

31.1 The project objective has been achieved – overall score as a percentage is 85% – 100% and more. The score is given if the project has been carried out with good or excellent scientific quality and has met or exceeded the expected objectives and scientific results. Where there is non-performance or other minor shortcomings, but the existing scientific results are of good scientific quality, e.g. the scientific articles are published in high quality journals, so that these shortcomings have not affected the achievement of the objective.

31.2 The project objective has not been achieved, does not correspond partially - overall score as a percentage is 25% - 84%. The score is awarded if the project has been carried out with sufficient scientific merit, the planned results of the project have been partially achieved, which has affected the overall achievement of the project objectives.

31.3 The project objective has not been achieved, does not correspond fully - overall percentage score 0% - 24%. The score is awarded if the project has been carried out with insufficient scientific quality, the planned results have been entirely or almost entirely not achieved, and the overall objective of the project has therefore not been achieved, or has been achieved to an insufficient extent.

32 Taking into account percentage score provided in clause 31 of the methodology, the Council calculates the refundable part of the funding as follows:

32.1 if the percentage of the Experts' objective rating referred to in Sub-clause 2.20 of the Contract is 60% to 65%, a flat rate of 5% applies;

32.2 if the percentage of the Experts' objective rating referred to in Sub-clause 2.20 of the Contract is between 50% and 59%, a flat rate of 10% applies;

32.3 if the percentage of the Experts' objective rating referred to in Sub-clause 2.20 of the Contract is below 50%, a flat rate of 25% applies.

1. Higher Education Law, Section 27(1) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Article 2(83) of European Commission Regulation (EU) No [651/2014](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/651/oj/?locale=LV) of 17 June 2014 declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty (Official Journal of the European Union, 26 June 2014, No L 187/1) )<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/651/oj/?locale=LV>) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Section 44(1) of the Law on Higher Education Institutions [↑](#footnote-ref-3)