



NCN EXPERTS' CODE OF ETHICS

1. General Provisions

- 1.1. Experts reviewing research proposals shall be informed in their actions by a concern for the advancement of science in Poland, and shall, inasmuch as their competences allow, support the research that primarily deserves promotion and financial aid.
- 1.2. When reviewing research proposals Experts shall proceed in conformity with the principles of objectivity and impartiality, using consistent criteria of evaluation, avoiding conflict of interest.
- 1.3. Experts are obliged to be discreet to an extent that will be conducive to unimpeded exchange of views, so as to prevent disclosing the authorship or contents of those views to outsiders.
- 1.4. Experts shall seek to uphold the good name of the National Science Centre.

2. Code of Ethics – Experts

- 2.1. The Expert is entrusted with accurate, diligent, thorough and impartial assessment of research proposals submitted to the NCN, and reports on projects', post-doc internships' and scholarships' progress and completion; the assessment shall be carried out in accordance with appropriate regulations adopted by the Council of the NCN.
- 2.2. The Expert is independent in his or her actions and judgments, obliged as he or she is to act in accordance with his or her own abilities, experience and best knowledge.
- 2.3. The Expert, carrying out his or her duties, commits to maintain full confidentiality as regards the review process, contents of the review and its authors. In particular, he or she may not exchange views on the proposal under evaluation with anyone, including other Experts, with the sole exception of the discussion during the official meeting of panel members.



- 2.4. A Member of the Panel of Experts may not be named as Principal Investigator nor Investigator in any proposal submitted to the call for which he or she has been selected as Expert; an External Expert may not be named as any of the above (i.e. Principal Investigator or Investigator) in any proposal submitted under the same group of disciplines for which he or she serves as an External Expert.
- 2.5. Member of the Panel of Experts may not be named in a proposal as supervisor of the Principal Investigator to project submitted under a call addressed to researchers beginning their career in research, without doctoral degree, or under calls for research projects offering doctoral scholarships and post-doc internships.
- 2.6. The Expert shall be excluded from evaluation of a proposal if he or she:
- works for the entity that has submitted the proposal,
 - was involved in drafting the proposal,
 - may expect direct personal benefit from a positive outcome of the appeal,
 - is a close relative of the Principal Investigator or legal representative of the proposal's host institution,
 - is, or over the past three years was, employed in the host institution employing the Principal Investigator,
 - because of any other important reasons, might be limited in his or her accurateness and impartiality.
- 2.7. The Expert may not review reports on the progress and completion of research proposals, post-doc internships and doctoral scholarships funded by the NCN if he or she:
- has been named in any of these proposals as either Principal Investigator or Investigator,
 - over the past three years was a superior or a research supervisor to the Principal Investigator in any of these proposals,
 - over the past three years, published works in collaboration with the Principal Investigator,
 - over the past three years, was employed in the host institution employing the Principal Investigator of a proposal under review,
 - is a close relative of the applicant, Principal Investigator or Investigators,



- is a legal custodian of or has been authorised by the Principal Investigator to act on his or her behalf,
- has come into personal conflict with the Principal Investigator or Investigators named in any of the proposals,
- because of any other important reasons, might be limited in his or her accurateness and impartiality.

2.8. Should the Expert, in the course of his or her duties, come to the conclusion that a conflict of interest has occurred, he or she must immediately contact the relevant NCN scientific officer and advise him or her of the fact.

2.9. The procedure of referring proposals to the external evaluation as well as the proceedings of external evaluation should adhere to the principles of maximum objectivity and impartiality.

3. Final Regulations

3.1. In matters not regulated by the hereby Code of Ethics, norms defined in the set of rules and guidelines “Dobre obyczaje w nauce” and recommendations assembled as “Dobra praktyka badań naukowych” shall be applied as appropriate.

3.2. Once the hereby Code of Ethics has been in place for two years, the Council of the National Science Centre shall conduct an overall assessment of its functioning, whereupon, if need be, changes may be introduced.