

Annex 1  
to Order No 10/2026  
of 28 January 2026  
by the Director of the National Science Centre  
amending the proposal evaluation procedure  
for MINIATURA 10

**Article 1**

The Order shall lay down the proposal evaluation procedure for the Expert Teams under MINIATURA 10.

**Article 2**

Whenever this Order refers to:

1. Council, it shall mean the Council of the National Science Centre;
2. Director, it shall mean the Director of the National Science Centre;
3. Coordinator, it shall mean a researcher employed as a Scientific Coordinator by the National Science Centre,
4. Expert, it shall mean an Expert Team member and
5. Ranking List, it shall mean a ranking list of proposals submitted in a month and recommended for funding.

**Article 3 - Coordinators**

The duties of the Coordinators shall include:

1. running eligibility checks on proposals;
2. naming Experts to draft individual reviews;
3. referring proposals for merit-based evaluation;
4. assessing the accuracy and impartiality of individual reviews drafted by the Experts and
5. providing the Director with the Ranking Lists for his approval.

**Article 4 - Experts**

The duties of the Experts shall include drafting individual reviews of proposals assigned by the Coordinator.

**Article 5 - Evaluation of proposals**

1. Proposals shall be subject to an eligibility check and merit-based evaluation.
2. The eligibility check shall be carried out by the Coordinators.
3. The merit-based evaluation shall be conducted by the Experts.
4. Only proposals approved as eligible by the Coordinators shall be accepted for the merit-based evaluation.
5. Proposals shall undergo a single-stage merit-based evaluation.

6. The merit-based evaluation of proposals shall consist in individual reviews drafted by three Experts working independently in accordance with the criteria laid down by the Council for the MINIATURA call.
7. The merit-based evaluation shall be performed based on the information specified in the proposal.
8. Experts may reject a proposal as ineligible at the stage of the merit-based evaluation.
9. A proposal shall not be recommended for funding if it has been given the score of “NO” by at least two Experts, in the same criterion subject to evaluation. The foregoing shall not apply to the ethics issues or data management plan.
10. Proposals shall be recommended for funding if they meet all of the following conditions:
  - 1) at least two individual reviews contain the answer “YES” to the question: “Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research activity?”,
  - 2) their minimum final grade, i.e., average of individual reviews performed by three Expert Team members, is 70 points for the following criteria:
    - a) merit-based evaluation of a research activity and justification thereof in view of the future research project,
    - b) evaluation of scientific achievements of the researcher carrying out a research activity,
    - c) and the costs budgeted in the proposal are within the pool of funds available for each month.
11. Proposals recommended for funding that have been given the same final score-based evaluation shall be recommended for funding as long as the total costs budgeted in all of them is within the pool of funds available for each month.

#### **Article 6 - Ranking Lists**

1. Ranking Lists shall be established by the Coordinators based on the list of proposals recommended for funding.
2. The Coordinators shall provide the Director with the Ranking Lists for his approval.

Disclaimer: This is not a certified translation and has been drafted for your convenience only. In the event of any discrepancies between the Polish and English language versions, the Polish language version will prevail.