MEDICAL RESEARCH AGENCY

SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT FORM

OPEN CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR RESEARCH EXPERIMENTS

CALL FOR PROPOSALS NUMBER: **ABM/2026/3**

APPLICATION NUMBER:.....

PROJECT TITLE: .....

APPLICANT: .....

DATE AND TIME OF RECEIPT OF THE APPLICATION: .....

EVALUATOR'S NAME: .....

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 1				
1	**The scientific value of the Project**	The following are assessed under this criterion: 1) the correct identification and precise definition of the research problem on the basis of current literature; 2) a clear description of the aim of the research and the rationale for undertaking the Research experiment, based on the current state of knowledge and the available treatment methods and medical procedures. Scientific value should be assessed in relation to the target population. The scientific value should represent a significant step forward in the development of new therapeutic approaches to the research problem identified in the Project; 3) justification of the appropriateness of the choice of research methods and tools (methodology), in particular: a) methods used to ensure the objectivity of the study (e.g. the use of randomization and blinding, and the types thereof, etc.); b) appropriateness and size of the experimental groups (the number of planned study groups – study arms), and the method for calculating group size;	0 – 10#	

c) planned statistical analyses relating to key outcomes demonstrating the clinical efficacy of the intervention undertaken;

d) frequency of measurements;

e) selecting the appropriate research hypotheses (null and alternative) and the type of research (e.g. superiority, non-inferiority);

f) selection of the control group.

When selecting a control group, reference should be made to the current standard of care at the relevant stage of treatment, including current clinical guidelines;

4) the selection of study endpoints, which should be measurable and designed in such a way as to allow the research hypotheses to be unequivocally confirmed or rejected;

5) planning research work appropriate to achieving the Project's objective. The work should be divided into clearly defined stages that form a logical whole;

6) precise definition and specification of Milestones. Properly defined Milestones should relate to the research issues addressed at a given stage and enable an objective (i.e. based on measurable parameters) assessment of the extent to which the research objectives set for that stage have been achieved. Milestones should make it possible to assess the impact of failing to achieve them on the justification for continuing with the Project;

7) the feasibility of achieving the research outcomes within the agreed timetable. The Project must identify and assess the likelihood of risks arising: clinical (related to the procedure under investigation), design-related, technological, registration-related, recruitment-related, and those

related to financial aspects, legal and administrative requirements (including the inclusion of sites in the research);

8) rational assessment of the recruitment potential for the study. The Application must provide a detailed description of the availability and feasibility of recruiting a population that meets the selection criteria for the proposed study, taking into account a market analysis, e.g. ongoing clinical trials or research experiments in Poland involving a similar population, reimbursed medical technologies, and the potential for competing medical technologies to be included on the reimbursement list (which could make it more difficult to recruit participants for the study). It is also necessary to specify the methods and sources that will be used to recruit the study population. A detailed description of the target population must be provided, including the justification for its selection, an estimate of the sample size (described in a way that allows the calculations to be verified), and the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants in the research experiment. An estimated recruitment rate should be provided, based on at least three published sources relating to the same medical condition or a similar intervention, a comparable population or analogous research activities. The sources used should include information that enables an assessment of recruitment feasibility, in particular regarding population size, the recruitment period, the number of participants or the number of centres. Data sources must be cited in such a way that they can be identified and verified (e.g. a scientific publication, an entry in a public research register, a study protocol or another publicly available document). In the absence of published data, an alternative basis for estimating the recruitment rate should be described, e.g. data from disease registries, healthcare databases, experience gained from previous projects, analyses of the number of patients treated at the centre, or other reliable data sources. The above information must be accompanied by figures that will enable an assessment to be made of whether

		the required number of participants can be recruited for the research by the planned number of sites within the specified timeframe; 9) the potential for publishing the Project's results. Please indicate whether the results of the Project will be published in accordance with the work planned in the Application in: o journals with a high impact factor; o mainstream journals in the relevant field; o scientific journals listed in the most recent, as at the date of publication of the results, *List of Scientific Journals and Peer-Reviewed Papers from International Conferences* published by the Minister of Science and Higher Education. The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. The criterion is assessed on the basis of the Application as a whole, with particular attention paid to the following fields: *Description of the scientific value of the Project and P – population in which the intervention will be used.* **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.** **For an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' under each statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges indicated below).**		

[#]Points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

The assessment is made on a scale of 0 to 10 points, with the score ranges for each rating, together with their descriptions, set out in the table below:

Number of points	Grade	Assessment description
10	excellent	An excellent Project. The research question addresses one of the most significant issues in the relevant field of medicine. The proposed research methodology complies with the highest scientific standards and represents a unique and innovative extension of the tools currently in use. The results of the Project, which was carried out as planned, hold significant potential to transform clinical practice across Europe or globally. The best general medical journals offer the best prospects for publishing the results. The scientific value of the findings has the potential to change the current state of knowledge and holds great promise for discoveries that will open up new avenues for research or treatment.
8 – 9	very good	A very good Project; the research question is relevant to the field of medicine under investigation and addresses a challenge of significance to medicine worldwide. The proposed research methodology is consistent with current best research practices and has the potential to improve them with regard to the clinical problem under investigation. The prospects for publication are very good; the results of the Project, if carried out as planned, may be published in the best specialist journals or leading general medical journals.
6 – 7	good	It's a good Project. The research question is relevant to the field of medicine under investigation or has the potential to yield significant scientific data. The proposed research methodology is tried and tested and offers the prospect of the Project being carried out as intended. The prospects for publication are good – the results of the fully completed project stand a good chance of being published in influential specialist journals. The cognitive value of the results is limited to the aspect relating to the direct outcomes of the Project.
4 – 5	average	An average Project. The research question bears little relation to the current challenges facing global medicine. Whilst the implementation of the project may be significant in terms of national needs, it does not offer any significant prospects for discoveries that could influence clinical practice on a global scale. The proposed research methodology has significant shortcomings or is limited in scope to simple, commonly used techniques that represent only a minor

		advancement on current clinical practice. The prospects for publishing the project's results are limited to journals with moderate impact in the field under investigation. The research value of the Project is limited, due to its geographical scope, scientific rigour or inadequate methodology.
2 – 3	poor	A poor design. The research question does not present a challenge in current clinical practice. The implementation of the project does little to meet the needs of national or global medicine and offers no prospect of changing clinical practice. The proposed research methodology has significant shortcomings which pose a substantial risk of the project failing. The project's publication prospects are limited to journals with minimal impact on clinical practice. The scientific benefits of carrying out the project are marginal, owing to methodological limitations and an insignificant research question.
0 – 1	very poor	A very poor Project. The research question concerns a trivial medical problem of minimal significance to the field under investigation. The proposed research methodology has significant shortcomings in terms of a substantive analysis of needs and potential solutions. Carrying out the project as planned does not allow for its objectives to be achieved. The results obtained will not affect medical practice, even if the Project is carried out as planned. The prospects for publication are low and limited to average-quality journals with no impact on the field of medicine under investigation. The potential cognitive benefits are minimal.

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 2				
2	**The impact of the Project on the improvement of the health of citizens, taking into account the necessity of:** **a) saving lives and achieving full recovery and/or saving lives and achieving recovery;** **b) preventing premature deaths;** **c) improving the quality of life.**	This criterion assesses the Project's impact on improving citizens' health, taking into account the need to: a) saving lives and achieving full recovery and/or saving lives and achieving recovery*; b) preventing premature deaths; c) improving the quality of life. This criterion assesses the impact of the Project's implementation on the lives and health of research participants as a result of medical procedures – including organizational procedures – as well as therapeutic, diagnostic, rehabilitative or preventive interventions. The impact of the Project's anticipated outcomes on the lives and health of people with the medical condition under investigation will also be assessed (no progression of the disease is defined as an improvement in quality of life). The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. The criterion is assessed on the basis of the Application as a whole, with particular attention paid to the field: *Description of the impact of the Project on improving the health of citizens.* **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.**	a) 0-2# b) 0-1# c) 0–1#	

		In order for an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' under each statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges set out below).		

* **The impact of the project is assessed as a whole**; that is, both criteria must be met. Projects awarded points in this regard should contribute to: 1) saving lives and 2) achieving full recovery and/or 1) saving lives and 2) improving health.

Points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

Assessment is carried out on a scale of 0 to 4 points; the scoring ranges for the respective grades, together with their descriptions, are set out in the table below:

Sub-criterion	Number of points	Description of the sub-criterion
(a) saving lives and achieving full recovery or achieving recovery	0-2	The impact of the project is assessed as a whole; that is, both criteria must be met. Projects awarded points in this regard should contribute to: 1) saving lives and 2) achieving full recovery, or 1) saving lives and 2) improving health. Under a given criterion, points may be awarded to projects with the aim to, for example, save lives and achieving recovery.
(b) preventing premature death	0-1	Under a given criterion, points may be awarded to projects aimed at preventing premature death.
(c) improving the quality of life	0-1	Under a given criterion, points may be awarded to projects aimed at improving quality of life (e.g. symptomatic treatment).
Under this criterion, points are awarded separately for each sub-criterion. **A project is considered good/very good/excellent if it has scored a total of at least 1 point.**		

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 3				
3	**Innovation of the Project**	For the purposes of assessing this criterion, an innovation is defined as the introduction of a new or significantly improved therapeutic solution in relation to the medical procedures—including organizational procedures, as well as therapeutic, diagnostic, rehabilitation or preventive interventions. When assessing the innovativeness of the Project, consideration should be given to whether the Project involves a research experiment enabling the implementation of solutions with innovative characteristics at national, European or global scale, i.e. whether there are any ongoing or completed randomized clinical trials or research experiments directly comparing the medical technologies under investigation in a population similar to that covered by the Project. The innovative value of the Project should also be analysed in the light of any ongoing non-commercial and commercial clinical trials or research experiments relating to topics similar to those covered by the submitted Project. The innovative value of the Project should also be assessed in the context of projects co-funded by the Agency. To do this, please use the MRA Projects search engine, available at: https://wyszukiwarka.abm.gov.pl/. The information presented in the Application must be consistent with the current state of knowledge and available treatment methods/medical procedures. They should be based on a review of the latest medical or scientific research literature, including articles published in international journals, conference reports, the state of the art reflected in patent literature, as well as information on ongoing Clinical Trials or Research Experiments in the relevant therapeutic area. The application should include	0 – 8#	

		basic information regarding the search carried out (keywords and descriptors used during the search, the time period covered by the search, and the database selected, e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov, MEDLINE, EMBASE). A proper description and justification should include the identification and description of the currently accepted 'gold standard' for the treatment of the condition in question, as well as alternative approaches (treatment regimens) described in national or international clinical practice guidelines or used in actual clinical practice for the indication covered by the Project. The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. The criterion is assessed on the basis of the Application as a whole, with particular attention paid to the following field: *Description of the innovativeness of the Project* and based on the results of the MRA project search engine. **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.** **In order for an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' under each statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges set out below).**		

Points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

Assessment is carried out on a scale of 0 to 8 points; the point ranges for the various grades, together with their descriptions, are set out in the table below:

Number of points	Grade	Assessment description
8	excellent	An excellent Project. A Project that is novel on a global scale and in the context of Projects funded byMRA. The proposed research methodology complies with the highest scientific standards and represents a unique and innovative extension of the tools currently in use. The results of the Project, which was carried out as planned, hold significant potential to transform clinical practice on a global scale. The scientific value of the findings has the potential to change the current state of knowledge and holds great promise for discoveries that open up new research or therapeutic possibilities.
6 – 7	very good	A very good Project. A project that is innovative both on a European scale and in the context of Projects carried out at MRA. The proposed research methodology is in line with current best research practices and has the potential to improve upon them in relation to the clinical problem under investigation. The scientific value of the findings has the potential to expand our current understanding.
4 – 5	good	It's a good Project. A Project that is innovative only at national level and in comparison, with other projects carried out at MRA. The proposed research methodology has already been applied at European and global level and offers the opportunity to implement the Project as intended within the national context. The informative value of the results is limited.
2 – 3	average	An average Project. A Project which, whilst not innovative on a national, European or global scale, nor on the scale of projects carried out at MRA, does introduce new elements of knowledge. Whilst the implementation of the project may be significant in terms of national needs, it does not offer any significant prospects for discoveries that could influence clinical practice at a European or global level. The proposed innovation constitutes a variation on existing domestic knowledge and is limited in its scope as regards contributing any significant novelty to current clinical practice. The Project's scientific value is limited, and it is unlikely to contribute significantly to the current state of knowledge.
0 – 1	poor / very poor	Poor/very poor Project. A Project that is not characterized by innovation at national, global or European level, nor within the framework of projects carried out on behalf of MRA. Implementing the project as planned offers no opportunity to introduce innovative solutions into clinical practice. The contribution of the results to scientific knowledge is negligible.

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 4				
4	**Expected economic effects**	The following are assessed under this criterion: 1) **expected economic effects for the healthcare system in Poland related to the potential introduction of the researched intervention into clinical practice (0–6 points).** The anticipated economic impact should be assessed in terms of its credibility, justification and potential significance for the healthcare system in Poland. It should also be assessed whether the comparison of the costs of the treatment regimens corresponding to all arms of the Research experiment has been presented in a complete and adequately justified manner. Furthermore, it is necessary to assess whether the costs of administering and using the treatment regimens under comparison reflect actual clinical practice; 2) **reasonableness of the Project's budget assumptions (0 – 4 points)** It is necessary to assess whether: a) eligibility of individual budget items is in accordance with the provisions of the Rules and Regulations; b) planned costs of the Project are necessary and directly related to the carrying out of the research work planned under the Project; c) the amount of the planned costs is appropriate (in line with market rates) and duly justified (e.g. supported by sources, valuations, etc.);	0 – 10[#]	

		d) the costs set out in the Project are commensurate with the expected results. The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. This criterion is assessed on the basis of the application as a whole. In particular, the assessment should take into account the content set out in the Application under point *Detailed budget of the Project* and in point *Description of the anticipated economic effects.* **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.** **In order for an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' under each statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges set out below).**		

points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

Assessment is carried out on a scale of 0 to 10 points; the scoring ranges for the grades, together with their descriptions, are set out in the table below:

Number of points	Grade	Assessment description
6 – 10	**excellent/very good/good**	Excellent/very good/good Project. The Project's objectives bring significant economic benefits for the Polish healthcare system. The economic analysis carried out is sound and indicates that financial benefits for the healthcare system can be achieved. Implementation of the Project may deliver significant long-term economic benefits compared with existing solutions or those currently under investigation. The Project budget has been drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the Rules and Regulations; the planned project costs are necessary and directly related to the research work planned under the Project and are commensurate with the expected results; the amount of the planned costs is appropriate (in line with market rates) and duly justified. No calculation errors have been identified in the Application, or any such errors are minor in number.
0 – 5	**average / poor / very poor**	Average/poor/very poor Project. The Project's objectives offer negligible economic benefits for the Polish healthcare system. The economic analysis carried out reveals significant shortcomings or errors that prevent the healthcare system from deriving any financial benefits. Implementation of the Project will not deliver significant long-term economic benefits compared with existing solutions or those currently under investigation. The costs set out in the Project budget are not in accordance with the provisions of the Rules and Regulations; the planned Project costs are not essential or directly related to the research work planned under the Project, nor are they commensurate with the expected results; the amount of the planned costs is not appropriate (in line with market rates) and is not adequately justified. Numerous accounting errors were identified in the Application.

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 5				
5	**Applicability of the Project results in the healthcare system**	The following are assessed under this criterion: 1) justification of the healthcare sector's need for the Project results, including the rationale for conducting research in the selected target population; 2) the impact of the proposed intervention (in terms of both clinical and financial outcomes) on improving the functioning of the healthcare system; 3) identification of barriers (e.g. systemic or financial) that could potentially hinder access to the Medical Technology under evaluation for the target patient population. The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. The criterion is assessed on the basis of the Application as a whole, with particular regard to the description in the section: *Description of the possibility of applying the results of the Project in the healthcare system* and in point *Description of the anticipated economic effects*. **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.** **In order for an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' under each statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges set out below).**	0 – 15#	

points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

The assessment is made on a scale of 0 to 15 points, with the score ranges for each rating, together with their descriptions, set out in the table below:

Number of points	Grade	Assessment description
13 – 15	excellent	An excellent Project. The proposed Project is likely to bring about a measurable change in clinical practice and have a positive impact on the healthcare system, either in the country or abroad. A thorough analysis of the potential for applying the findings within the Polish or international healthcare system raises no substantive objections or is supported by reliable data. The risk that the alternative solutions developed will limit the impact of the Project's results is minimal.
10 – 12	very good	A very good Project. The proposed Project could contribute to a significant improvement in the quality of the healthcare system in Poland and, potentially, in other countries. The described opportunities for applying the Project results are reasonable, supported by a robust analysis, and indicate a realistic potential to change clinical practice. The emergence of alternatives to those examined in this Project may partially limit the usefulness of its findings.
8 – 9	good	It's a good Project. The proposed Project may yield solutions with potential applications in clinical practice, provided it is fully implemented or the Applicant's objectives regarding cost-effectiveness are met. The results of the Project are likely to be relevant to clinical practice in Poland, but their applicability in other countries is severely limited. The potential applications of the Project's results described above are optimistic but feasible, provided that the Project's objectives are achieved and no better solutions emerge.
5 – 7	average	An average project. Even if fully implemented as planned, the proposed Project will not deliver solutions with a high likelihood of being adopted in clinical practice in Poland or abroad. The Project Description contains significant methodological errors. The assessment of the Project's potential impact on improving the healthcare system is incomplete, overly optimistic or contains methodological errors in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed

		solutions.
0 – 4	poor / very poor	A poor/very poor project. Even if fully implemented as planned, the proposed Project will not deliver solutions that can be applied in clinical practice in Poland or abroad. The assessment of the Project's potential impact on improving the healthcare system contains numerous and critically significant methodological errors, or fails to refer to current or projected scenarios, or contains significant errors in the assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed solutions.

No.	STATUTORY CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
STATUTORY CRITERION NO. 6				
6	**Possession by the Applicant (referred to in Article 17(1) of the MRA Act) of material and human resources necessary for the implementation of the Project**	This criterion assesses the likelihood of achieving the project's objectives through the appropriate selection of the project team and project management approach, and verifies whether the technical resources currently available or planned for acquisition will ensure the project is carried out correctly. The following are assessed under this criterion: **1) Material resources (0 – 3 points);** It should be assessed whether the project team has the appropriate technical resources, including access to its own medical infrastructure (healthcare providers) and scientific and research facilities (i.e. premises, apparatus and other necessary equipment) to carry out the Project. If the Applicant does not have all the necessary resources, the plan for acquiring them (through subcontracting or purchase) should be assessed. **2) Human resources (0 – 4 points);** It should be assessed whether the project team, and in particular the Head of Research Experiment, **possesses the knowledge and experience** in carrying out research and development projects that are appropriate to the scope and nature of the planned work, and: o whether the Head of Research experiment has a specialization in a field of medicine that is particularly relevant given the nature or course of the experiment, as well as sufficiently high professional and research qualifications;	0 – 7#	

		○ is the Head of Research experiment **able to commit fully** to the proposed Project, given their current workload (the Head of Research experiment should specify: the number of projects they are currently involved in, the extent of their involvement and the role they play in them, as well as the extent of their involvement arising from other commitments, such as: an employment contract, a contract for services, etc.); ○ does the Application specify **the roles of key members of the project team**, taking into account their competences, scope of duties and level of involvement in the implementation of the Project. ○ **has provision been made for the Project team to be supported** by the Applicant's experienced staff in the administration of the Research experiment and the financial settlement of the project. Where the Applicant intends to entrust part of the work to a subcontractor, they should set out the requirements regarding the subcontractor's capacity. The expert assesses the information set out in the Application on the basis of their own knowledge and experience. Verification of this criterion is based on the Application as a whole, and in particular on the description *of The potential of the entity responsible for the implementation of the Project – in relation to its technical, financial and administrative capacity*, as well as the information contained in the description found under the tab *Principal Investigator/ Head of Research experiment/ R&D Manager/ Project Manager.* **As part of the assessment, reference should be made to each of the above-mentioned points in the justification of the points granted.** **In order for an application to be recommended for funding, it must be assessed as at least 'good' undereach statutory criterion (in accordance with the scoring ranges set out below).**		

points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

The assessment is made on a scale of 0 to 7 points, with the score ranges for each rating, together with their descriptions, set out in the table below:

Number of points	Grade	Assessment description
6 – 7	excellent very good	An excellent/very good project. The Applicant's resources fully meet the Project's needs. The shortcomings are minor or will be rectified during the course of the Project and do not pose a significant risk of failure. The Principal Investigator and the team have extensive experience and a range of skills enabling them to carry out all Project tasks. The Principal Investigator's competence in project management, or the managerial competence of those supporting them in this role, is demonstrated by examples of the successful delivery of similar scientific or clinical projects and minimizes the risk of the project failing.
4 – 5	good	It's a good project. An assessment of the applicant's resources reveals significant shortcomings in terms of the expertise, infrastructure and administrative capacity required to implement the project. Any errors or omissions identified pose a risk to the success of the Project and may require a significant amount of work to minimize that risk. The Principal Investigator and the team have relevant experience in conducting research projects or clinical trials. The Principal Investigator has experience in carrying out projects and in project management, including in the role of project manager or manager of key tasks within projects. The Principal Investigator's project management skills are appropriate for this Project, or adequate support has been provided by individuals with managerial skills to ensure the successful completion of the Project.
0 – 3	average / poor / very poor	An average/poor/very poor project. An assessment of the applicant's resources reveals critical shortcomings in terms of the expertise, infrastructure and administrative capacity required to implement the project. The errors or omissions identified rule out the possibility of the Project being carried out effectively. The Principal Investigator and their team have moderate experience in carrying out research projects or clinical trials. The Principal Investigator's project management skills are limited. The Project does not provide adequate support from individuals with managerial

		competencies.

No.	BONUS CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
BONUS CRITERION NO. 1				
1	**The research experiment concerns:** • **rehabilitation programmes, including psychophysical interventions;** • **surgical procedures.**	Under this criterion, the assessment focuses on whether the research problem identified in the Project relates to: • **rehabilitation programmes, including psychophysical interventions;** • **surgical procedures.** Compliance with this criterion will be verified, in particular, on the basis of the information contained in the following fields of the Application: • In Part II.B of the Application, in the *'Health problem'* field, • In Part II.B of the Application, in field *P – population in which the intervention will be used.* **If more than one condition is met, the bonuses <u>are not cumulative</u>. A maximum of 2 points can be awarded under this criterion.** Failure to provide information in the indicated fields of the Application necessary to verify fulfilment of the criterion will constitute a premise preventing fulfilment of the criterion and therefore the bonus points will not be awarded. *This criterion is not mandatory. Failure to meet a criterion does not mean that the grant application will be rejected.*	0 /#2	

points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.

No.	BONUS CRITERIA		Scoring	Result
BONUS CRITERION NO. 2				
2	**Documented active international scientific and networking collaboration**	Bonus points under this criterion are awarded where the applicant demonstrates documented and active membership of international scientific, research-clinical or expert networks. The aim of this criterion is to promote Projects carried out by organizations operating within an international scientific community, thereby facilitating the exchange of knowledge, access to best research practices, expert collaboration and an increase in the potential for implementing the Project's results. In order for points to be awarded for this criterion, Project Applicants seeking funding **must demonstrate in total** that: • the organization implementing the Project has been a member of an international scientific, research, research--clinical or expert network for at least 24 months; • membership is institutional in nature, i.e. it applies to the organization carrying out the project, rather than solely to the individual membership of a single employee; • membership is valid as at the date of submission of the Application; • during the 24 months preceding the date of submission of the Application, the organization participated in at least two activities carried out as part of this network, such as: o working groups	0 / 4#	

		○ joint projects, ○ drawing up recommendations or guidelines, ○ expert consultations, ○ workshops or training courses, ○ implementation measures, ○ developing common standards of conduct. Compliance with the criterion will be verified on the basis of the appendixes attached to the application: • a document confirming membership or international cooperation; • documents confirming active participation in at least two activities during the 24 months preceding the date of submission of the application; • a description of the significance of the collaboration (a description in the form of a document not exceeding one A4 page – font Times New Roman, size 12). If the Applicant has attached supporting documents confirming that all the criteria listed above have been met in full, 4 points shall be awarded. If the Applicant has not attached supporting documents confirming that all the criteria listed above have been met, or if the documents submitted do not confirm that the above conditions have been met, 0 points shall be awarded. *This criterion is not mandatory. Failure to meet a criterion does not mean that the grant application will be*		

		rejected.		

points from the pool allocated for a given criterion are awarded by the Application Evaluation Team as part of the first stage of the substantive assessment.