

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

**Contents**

Introduction .....	1
1. Terms Used .....	2
2. Scientific Expertise of the Project Proposal.....	3
2.1. Individual Review of the Project Proposal .....	4
2.2 Consolidated Review of the Project Proposal.....	7
3. Scientific Expertise of the Project Interim and Final Scientific Report.....	8
3.1 Individual Review of the Project Interim and Final Scientific Report .....	8
3.2 Consolidated Review of the Project Interim and Final Scientific Report.....	10
3.3 Evaluation of the Goal of the Final Scientific Report of the Project .....	10

**Introduction**

The methodology for performing the expertise for the project interim/final scientific report (hereinafter referred to as the expertise performance methodology) was developed in accordance with Cabinet Regulation 560 “Procedure for conducting state research programme projects” of 4 September 2018 (hereinafter referred to as the Cabinet Regulation) and the Defence Innovation Research Programme state research programme open call for project proposals (hereinafter referred to as the call) approved on 29 October 2021 by the State Implementation and Supervision Commission for the Defence Innovation Research Programme state research programme (hereinafter referred to as the regulations).

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 main objective of the Programme is the development of new knowledge, skills and solutions in priority research and technology fields of the national defence sector.

The objective of the Programme is promoting technology transfer and development of innovative applied research solutions and products as part of the defence technology priorities defined in the policy planning documents of the national defence sector and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereinafter – NATO).

The Programme is to result in the creation of a new or improved product, prototype or technological solution in any of the following fields:

1. cybersecurity and electronic warfare for secure communication and more economic solutions for cyberspace controls;

2. robotics, unmanned aerial vehicle systems and related autonomy solutions;

3. individual soldier systems, including personal gear, and textile technologies.

In implementing the project, one technical objective of the call for projects shall be completed, and all the objectives listed in Clause 7 of the Order and all the horizontal objectives listed in Clause 8 of the Order shall be completed.

### 1. Terms Used

No	Term	Explanation
1.	<b>Scientific team</b>	scientific personnel and research technical personnel 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 personnel 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.	<b>Scientific personnel</b>	leading researchers, researchers, scientific assistants, academic staff <sup>1</sup> of an institution of higher education, and students (including also researchers, students, candidates for doctoral degree and new scientists from abroad and diaspora).
3.	<b>Project applicant</b>	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 <sup>2</sup> . The submitter of the project proposal is responsible for the implementation of the project and achievement of the project results in general.
4.	<b>Project cooperation partner - scientific institution</b>	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.	<b>Project cooperation partner - public institution</b>	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.	<b>Principal investigator</b>	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

<sup>1</sup> Section 27(1) of the Law on Higher Education

<sup>2</sup> Article 2(83) of the 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>)

		implementation in accordance with the procedures laid down in Cabinet Regulation.
7.	<b>Lead participant of the project</b>	a scientist who implements the project or sub-project and is responsible for the implementation of the parts thereof.
8.	<b>Participant of the project</b>	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.	<b>University student</b>	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 <sup>3</sup> . University students and candidates for doctoral degree shall be involved in the project according to the conditions specified in Paragraphs 21–24 of the Procedure.
10.	<b>Responsible contact person of the project applicant in the project (hereinafter referred to as the project contact person)</b>	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 project proposal. If there are cooperation partners in the project, their contact persons shall also be indicated.
11.	<b>Expert</b>	a scientist who performs the individual 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.	<b>Project results</b>	scientific results of the project according to Paragraph 12 of the Cabinet Regulation and achievable results according to Clause 7 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 proposals meet 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 6 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 7 to the Procedure "Contract on the Performance of Expertise" (hereinafter referred to as — the expertise contract).

<sup>3</sup> Section 44(1) of the Law on Higher Education

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 observe 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. In accordance with Section 42 of these regulations, the expert may only assess 15 pages, additionally reviewing up to three pages if there are social partner statements, letters of recommendation by partners and similar documents 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) in the information system, which is formed in accordance with Annex 9 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:

<b>Individual/Consolidated Expert Review of the Project Proposal</b>		
Project title:		
Expert(-s):		
<b>1.</b>	<b>Criterion: Scientific quality of the project</b>	Maximum score: 5 points
<b>1.1</b>	Consideration: the scientific quality, credibility, and novelty of the research	<p><i>The expert shall justify the evaluation thereof with points, taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion in general and the fulfilment of the considerations of each criteria.</i></p> <p><i>1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Section 1 “Scientific excellence” and also in Subsection 2.4 “Scientific results and provision of the availability thereof” and in Subsection 3.1 “Submitter of the project proposal and scientific team” of the description of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion, <b>the project proposal shall be taken into account as a whole</b>;</i></p> <p><i>2. The expert assesses the project idea and concept for the development of a new or improved technology, innovative solution or product prototype, its novelty and originality, added value, applicability to the priority field of research, and competitiveness in the context of the EU and NATO. The expert must assess the selected research strategy and methodological solutions, as well as the capacity to produce new knowledge and technologies. The expert assesses if the planned activities are appropriate for developing the project results. The expert assesses the involvement of project partners (if any) and their suitability for completing the project;</i></p> <p><i>3. Thematic and horizontal objectives of the programme, results, their implementation possibilities shall 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 selected priority research field of the project;</i></p> <p><i>4. The overall potential of the project in improving the knowledge base in the fields of the project with the goal of building a foundation for technological development and innovations is assessed.</i></p>
<b>1.2</b>	Consideration: scientific quality of the selected research strategy and methodological solutions, as well as compliance for the achievement of specific goals	
<b>1.3</b>	Consideration: ability of the project to create new knowledge or technological conclusions	
<b>1.4</b>	Consideration: contribution of cooperation partners (if any), their scientific capacity, planned cooperation quality.	

2.	<b>Criterion: Impact of project results</b>	Maximum score: 5 points
2.1.	Consideration: expected transfer of the acquired knowledge and skills in further activity and the development of scientific capacity	<i>The expert shall 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.</i>
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information specific to the criterion is provided in Section 2 “Impact” of the description of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion, <b>the project proposal shall be taken into account as a whole.</b></li> <li>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 shall be evaluated in accordance with 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 submitter of the project proposal and project cooperation partners (if any), as well as the specific objectives of the programme.</li> </ol>
2.3	Consideration: the research will lead to the creation of programmes for the achievement of goals, knowledge relevant to the sector, economic and social development, or policy recommendations and solutions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The expert assesses the project strategy for increasing the influence of the new or improved technology, innovative solution or product prototype on defence and security, as well as the possibility of both using it in defence and finding potential uses in civilian fields. The expert additionally assesses the strategy for registering intellectual property rights. The expert assesses if the items planned in the project are not made redundant by the technologies and solutions already developed by EU and NATO member states.</li> </ol>
2.4	Consideration: sustainability of the acquired knowledge and a qualitative plan for the dissemination thereof, including the planned scientific publications and public information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The expert assesses the influence of the project on the research community, developing the resources necessary for research. It shall be evaluated how effectively the students and new scientists are involved, which includes evaluating the plan for student involvement and increasing the capacity of the scientific team within the project. The expert assesses the plan for the plan resulting in an increased capacity of the research group to consult defence institutions on the matters pertaining to the scope of the project.</li> </ol>
2.5	Consideration: research implementation promotes strengthening of the scientific capacities of the scientific personnel of the research, including students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The expert evaluates the sustainability of the project results in combination 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 2.4 “Scientific results of the project and provision of availability thereof” of the description of the project proposal. Particular attention must be paid to ensuring the sustainability of the results, providing data as a result of research and experimentation. The expert also assesses the applications to other EU and NATO calls for research projects planned in the project, with the intention of continuing what is started in the project.</li> <li>6. The expert takes into account the potential of the project to inform the public about the project results and</li> </ol>

		<i>ensuring knowledge transfer and awareness of the role and contribution of research 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 2.3).</i>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and provision</b>	Maximum score: 5 points
<b>3.1</b>	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 planned work stages and objectives are clearly defined, appropriate and credible	<i>The expert shall 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.</i>  <i>1. Information which is specific to the criterion is provided in Section 3 “Implementation” of the description of the project proposal and Part C “Curriculum Vitae” of the project proposal but, upon evaluation of the criterion, the project proposal shall be taken into account as a whole.</i>
<b>3.2</b>	Consideration: scientific qualification of the principal investigator and lead participants of the project on the basis of the submitted curriculum vitae (CV)	<i>2. The project feasibility, including the prepared work plan of the research, intended project management and quality management thereof, intended resources, available infrastructure shall 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).</i>
<b>3.3</b>	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	<i>3. The expert shall 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 only submitted by the principal investigator and lead participants).</i>
<b>3.4</b>	Consideration: there is infrastructure necessary for conducting the research and the access to other research infrastructure of cooperation partners (if applicable)	<i>The planned project implementation shall 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.</i>
<b>3.5</b>	Consideration: institution which implements the research and its cooperation partners (if applicable) have the experience necessary for the project implementation	<i>It should be considered that the duration of implementation of one project is 24 months.</i>

## 2.2 Consolidated Review of the Project Proposal

14. 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 9 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, a consolidated review agreed in accordance with Clause 15 of the Methodology shall be prepared and submitted to the Information System.

15. All experts of the respective project proposal shall agree on the consolidated review referred to in Clause 14 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.

16. 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:

16.1 score in points for each criterion;

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

17. Within three days after the submission of the consolidated project assessment via the information system, the Council assesses its compliance with the methodology and approves it via 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 and improvement.

18. 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 41 of the Procedure.

### **3. Scientific Expertise of the Project Interim and Final Scientific Report**

19. Within one month from the project mid-term, i.e. 12 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.

20. 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**

21. Within two weeks from the conclusion of the expertise contract with the Council, the expert shall perform the individual review of the project interim/final scientific report by completing

and validating Annex 11 to the Procedure “Form of the Individual/Consolidated Review of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report” in the Information System.

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

- 22.1 to continue the project;
- 22.2 not to continue the project;

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

- 23.1 the project goal is achieved;
- 23.2 the project goal is not achieved;

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

<b>Individual/Consolidated Review of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report</b>	
Project title:	
Expert(-s):	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Criterion: Scientific quality of the project</b>
	<p><i>The expert shall 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 / conclusion 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 shall 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 objectives and results shall 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.</i></p> <p><i>The expert shall evaluate whether the results achieved by the scientific team of the project in the relevant time period reflect the high research and innovation capacity thereof and whether the results described are sufficient for improving the knowledge base in the field of defence.</i></p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Criterion: Impact of project results</b>
	<p><i>The expert shall 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 / conclusion 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 shall give his/her comment, proposals 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 evaluation must take the following considerations into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. the expected impact to be created by the results is achieved, including the planned transfer of the results to subsequent activities, improvement in research capacity, and opportunities for further research;</i></li> <li><i>2. completion of the project plan for increasing the influence of the new or improved technology, innovative solution or product prototype on defence and security, as well as the possibility of both using it in defence and finding potential uses in civilian fields;</i></li> <li><i>3. the influence of the project on the research community, developing the resources necessary for research. The degree of effectiveness, at which students and young researchers were involved in the project, along with the achievement of the targets for involving students and</i></li> </ol>

	<p><i>increasing the capacity of the research group as part of the project, including the capacity consult defence institution on the matters within the scope of the project;</i></p> <p><i>4. sustainable association of the project’s results with the planned scientific publications and the distribution of project results among the science community, and especially the accumulation of data as a result of research and experimentation. A plan for preparing project proposals for other EU and NATO calls for research project proposals;</i></p> <p><i>5. The potential of the project to inform the public about the project results and ensuring knowledge transfer and awareness of the role and contribution of research to the public, including informative popular science articles on the performed research, their results and public benefit (including the fulfilment of the plan specified in the project application).</i></p>
3.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Criterion: Project implementation possibilities and provision</b></p> <p><i>The expert shall 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 shall give his/her comment and suggestions for correction of the agenda or research opportunities after the end of the respective project.</i></p> <p><i>The expert shall evaluate whether the project management has been successful, including by taking into account the overall progress of the project implementation. It shall 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.</i></p> <p><i>The expert additionally assesses and indicates if students and young researchers were sufficiently involved in the project up to the stage specified.</i></p>

### **3.2 Consolidated Review of the Project Interim and Final Scientific Report**

25. 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.

26. 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 11 to the Procedure “Form of Individual/Consolidated Review of the Project Interim/Final Scientific Report”, observing the conditions specified in Clauses 21-24 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.

27. In the consolidated review of the project interim/final report, the experts shall agree on a joint evaluation for the project interim/final scientific report according to Clauses 22 and 23 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**

28. In case when the consolidated evaluation of the final scientific report of the project indicates that “Project goal is achieved”, 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:

28.1 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 name, the experts shall evaluate the units which by their nature correspond to the words “goal” and “objective”;

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

28.3 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.

29. 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.