**Expert evaluation of grant funding proposal\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**(IRN and name of SSTE object)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№** | **Evaluation criterion** | **Expert comment** | **Indicator** | **Criterion score** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. | The novelty, relevance and viability of the project |  | Novelty and relevance of the proposed scientific and technical level of the project (do not exceed 200 words)  How new are the hypotheses, ideas and expected results of the research?  How new are the scientific and/or methodological problem areas investigated in the project? How novel are the approaches and methods used by the applicant in the research plan? How up-to-date and relevant are they? How relevant is the literature referred to by the authors of the project? | (0 to 3) |
|  | The importance, relevance of the proposed scientific and technical level and the extent to which the project is developed for the development of science (do not exceed 300 words)  How important are the scientific problems solved by the project? How relevant is the project to global trends? How promising are the hypotheses, ideas and expected results of the research? Can the project be a breakthrough for the development of science? How high is the quality of the journals chosen to publish the research results?  Does the quality and quantity of the project's planned publications meet the requirements of the tender documentation? How reasonable is the number of articles planned to be published by the applicant? | (0 to 6) |
| 2. | Quality and feasibility of the research plan |  | The quality of the research plan (do not exceed 150 words)  How well-founded is the research problem? How clearly has the applicant formulated the aims, questions, hypotheses and assumptions of the research plan? Are the hypotheses (assumptions) scientific and realistic? | (0 to 3) |
|  | Quality of research methodology (do not exceed 250 words)  How sound are the methods used in the study? How appropriate are the methods and approaches to the aims, objectives, hypotheses and expected results? How reliable are the applicant's means of collecting baseline data and their sources? Does the applicant demonstrate consistency between the research questions and data collection methods? How well designed are the experiments for the subsequent statistical processing of the data obtained? How well will the applicant address issues related to the prevention of plagiarism, falsification and fabrication of data, false co-authorship and attribution of results? How well does the applicant address the ethical issues relating to animal and human research? How well did the applicant comply with relevant regulations? Other expert comments on the quality of the proposed research methods and approaches and their relevance to the purpose, objectives and expected results, the quality of the research design. | (0 to 3) |
|  | Achievability of results (do not exceed 250 words)  How likely is it that the expected results of the project will be achieved? How likely is it that the research findings will be accepted for publication in the journals specified in the application?  What are the risks to successful completion of the research? What is their extent and how well is the applicant designed to respond to the risks? Are there alternative ways and approaches to the project? To what extent does the applicant's proposed research plan have advantages over the alternatives? | (0 to 3) |
| 3. | Expected results and their relevance |  | Project effectiveness and efficiency (do not exceed 250 words)  How are the expected results of the project commensurate with the requested amount of funding? How effectively will the project's funds be spent to achieve the expected results? What measures will be taken to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the research? | (0 to 3) |
|  | Relevance and applicability of the expected results (do not exceed 300 words)  In which area can the expected results of the study be applied? What is the nature and scope of the problem to be solved by them?  Are the expected results competitive with existing counterparts (if there are no counterparts, with existing solutions to a similar problem)?  What are the possible social, economic, environmental or other effects of the project?  What are the ways to use the expected research results? To what extent will they be ready for practical application and commercialisation? What constraints will there be to their application?  How likely are the articles published as a result of the project to be regularly used and cited?  What role does the project contribute to the training of young researchers (undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral) under the age of 40?  How clearly and comprehensively articulated is the significance of the expected results? To what extent is the applicant's opinion on the relevance of the expected results credible and justified? | (0 to 6) |
| 4 | Competence and scientific background of the research team |  | Scientific level and background of the project leader (do not exceed 250 words)  Does the supervisor regularly publish articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals in the field of the project, including as principal author (correspondent or first author)? How high is the quality of the journals in which the supervisor publishes the results of his/her research? Does the supervisor have a track record of successfully managing research projects that have published articles in peer-reviewed journals? Does the supervisor have a scientific background in the form of articles on the topic of the project? | (0 to 3) |
|  | Quality of the research team (do not exceed 250 words)  How well grounded is the composition of the research team? How clearly justified is the role of each research team member in the study? To what extent is their contribution necessary to complete the research in accordance with the established purpose, objectives, expected outcomes and proposed research design? How well qualified and experienced are the research team members according to their role and position in the project? Are the project participants sufficiently qualified to work on the equipment being purchased?  If foreign scientists are involved in the project, is their involvement justified in terms of their role in achieving the project's aims, objectives and expected outputs? Is the scope and level of expertise of the foreign experts relevant to the needs of the research plan? | (0 to 3) |
|  | Availability of resources and access to infrastructure (do not exceed 300 words)  To what extent does the infrastructure available to the applicant meet the needs of the research plan? To what extent do the research equipment and other tools available to the applicant allow the application of the proposed approaches and research methods? How justified is the use of external infrastructure in the project? How justified is the purchase of equipment for the project in relation to the purpose, objectives, and scope of the project? Do the materials procured by the applicant in the project comply with the research plan? Are the project participants sufficiently qualified to operate the equipment being purchased? Will the project participants be able to effectively use the equipment purchased, including after project completion? What is the justification for using co-executives in the project? Can the members of the research team carry out the work themselves? | (0 to 3) |
| 5 | Project interdisciplinarity |  | (do not exceed 100 words)  2 points - if the project is interdisciplinary in terms of cooperation between broad research areas, interdisciplinary approach is fully justified in the application and is necessary to achieve the project objective;  1 point - if the project is interdisciplinary, but the approach presented in the application is not sufficiently justified or does not fully meet the goal of the project, or the interdisciplinary approach is assumed in terms of interaction between narrow research areas;  0 points - if the project is not interdisciplinary, or the approach presented in the application is not justified and does not meet the purpose of the project.  Briefly justify the expert's opinion. | |
| Final score | | The sum of the total points for all the above evaluation criteria | | |
| Reasonableness of the funding requested | | (do not exceed 250 words)  Based on the basic quantitative parameters of the application (e.g., number of researchers, number of materials and equipment to be purchased, number of missions, etc.), assess whether the amount of funding requested by the applicant (in monetary and/or in-kind resource units) corresponds to the significance of the project and the actual amount of funds needed to achieve the project objective and expected results.  If adjustments are necessary, specify for which specific items and how much (quantitative) adjustments are necessary without compromising the achievement of the project objectives. | | |
| Relevance to the priority area | | (do not exceed 100 words)  Assess whether the application corresponds to the priority field and the specialised scientific field for which it has been submitted, briefly justifying the expert's opinion. | | |
| Strengths | | (do not exceed 150 words)  List briefly the key benefits of the study and its characteristics that will achieve the stated project objective. | | |
| Weaknesses | | (do not exceed 150 words)  Briefly list the main weaknesses of the study and the extent to which they affect the achievement of the expected results. Separately, highlight the weaknesses that are critical to the project and that call into question the achievement of its objective. | | |
| Full name *(if any) of the expert* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | |

**Evaluation form on the application for program targeting funding**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(**IRN and name of SSTE object)**)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№** | **Name of assessment criterion** | **Expert comment** | **Reviewer comments with answers to leading questions** | |
| 1. | Innovativeness of the research plan |  | (do not exceed 150 words)  Is the information provided to support the innovativeness of the research plan, sufficient for a full and qualitative assessment of the application for this criterion?  How reasonable and credible are the arguments of the applicant about the innovativeness of the research plan?  Any other comments on the applicant's substantiation of the innovativeness of the research plan. | (score from 0 to 3) |
| (do not exceed 300 words)  How novel are the expected results of the study?  How novel are the scientific and/or methodological problem areas studied in the project?  How novel are the approaches and methods used by the applicant in the research plan? How modern and relevant are they?  How highly ranked are the journals selected to publish research results?  How significant are the expected results of the study in the global and local aspects?  Any other comments on the applicant's substantiation of the innovativeness of the research plan. | (score from 0 to 6) |
| 2. | Quality and feasibility of the research plan |  | (do not exceed 150 words)  How substantiated is the research problem?  How clear is the applicant in formulating the aims, objectives and hypotheses of the research plan? Are hypotheses scientific?  To what extent can the tasks of a scientific and technical assignment for performing research be solved? To what extent can the results of the scientific and technical assignment be achieved? | (score from 0 to 3) |
| (do not exceed 250 words)  How justified are the methods used in the study?  How do the methods and approaches use correspond to the goals, objectives, hypotheses and expected results?  How reliable are the methods of collecting initial data by the applicant and its sources? Does the applicant demonstrate consistency between research questions and data collection methods? Have the experiments been planned correctly for subsequent statistical processing of the data and to what extent?  How effectively will the applicant address issues relating to the prevention of plagiarism, falsification, and fabrication of data, false co-authorship, and the assignment of results?  To what extent did the applicant address ethical issues related to experimental studies on animals and humans? How well does the applicant comply with the relevant standards?  Any other expert’s comments on the quality of the proposed methods and approaches to the research and their compliance with the goal, objectives and expected results, the quality and research plan in general. | (score from 0 to 3) |
| (do not exceed 250 words)  How realistic are the goals, hypotheses and expected results of the research plan?  To what extent is a research plan implementable from the standpoint of the adequacy of resources, the timing and content of the work performed to the goals, objectives, methodology and expected results of the study?  What are the risks of the successful completion of the study? What is their degree, and to what extent has the applicant developed risk response questions?  Are there alternative ways and approaches to project implementation? How competitive is the research plan proposed by the applicant compared to alternatives?  How reasonable is the number of articles planned by the applicant for publication? Does the quality and quantity of publications meet the requirements of the tender documentation?? How likely is it that the research results will be accepted for publication in the journals indicated in the application? How likely is the publication of research results in leading scientific journals from the first quartile of bibliographic databases?  Any other expert’s comments on the feasibility of the research plan. | (score from 0 to 3) |
| 3. | Significance and applicability of expected results |  | (do not exceed 150 words)  How clear and complete is the complainant of the significance of the expected results? Is the applicant's opinion about the significance of the expected results reliable and reasonable? | (score from 0 to 3) |
| (do not exceed 300 words)  In what area can the expected results of the study be applied? What is the nature and scale of the problem solved with their help?  Are the expected results competitive in comparison with existing alternatives (if there are no alternatives - in comparison with existing solutions of a similar problem)?  How justified are the social, economic, environmental or other effects of the project’s implementation? How will research results affect the level and competitiveness of the scientific and technical potential of Kazakhstan?  In addition to solving strategically important state tasks, does the successful achievement of the goal and objectives of the program contribute to a significant change in the situation in the field of production, science, education? To what extent do the results obtained contribute to the development of strategically important state tasks?  Does the program involve obtaining results that have significant potential for implementation, commercialization, and product development? For a social program, is the coverage of potential beneficiaries (improvement of living conditions, work, etc.) significant in the implementation (use) of the program results?  Are the expected results of the program green, energy efficient, competitive? Is the forecast of the consequences / results of the implementation of scientific, scientific-technical and innovative programs achievable? Is the achievement of scientific, technical, socio-economic, environmental (if necessary) consequences/results of program implementation ensured?  What are the ways to use the expected research results? How ready will they be for the practical use? What restrictions will exist for their application?  How likely is it that the articles published as a result of the project will be regularly cited by other scientists? Any other expert’s comments about the significance of the expected results of the study. | (score from 0 to 6) |
| 4. | Applicant’s competence and quality of the research environment |  | (do not exceed 150 words)  How fully and qualitatively research groups and research environments are described? How does the description of the research environments allow to evaluate its compliance with the research plan? | (score from 0 to 2) |
| (do not exceed 300 words)  How qualitative is the composition of the research group?  How substantiated is the role of each member of the research group in the study? How much of their contribution is needed to complete the research following the stated goal, objectives, expected results and proposed research plan?  How do the qualifications and experience of the group leader and members of the research group meet the needs and profile of the study? Does the group leader regularly publish articles in leading international peer-reviewed scientific journals as the main author (correspondence author or first author), including in the area of the project?  To what extent the study does train the undergraduate and postgraduate students, as well as young scientists under 40 years old, as researchers? How justified is their role by the research plan?  Any other expert’s comments about the significance of the expected results of the study. | (score from 0 to 3) |
|  |  |  | (do not exceed 300 words)  How far does the applicant’s infrastructure meet the needs of the research plan?  How much research equipment and other tools available to the applicant allows the proposed approaches and research methods to be applied?  How reasonable is the use of third-party contractors in a project?  How justified is the purchase of equipment within the project from the perspective of the goals, objectives, and scope of the project? Do the equipment and materials to be purchased by the applicant within the framework of the requested funding comply with the research plan?  Do project participants have sufficient qualifications to work on the purchased equipment? Will the project participants be able to effectively use the acquired equipment, also upon the completion of the project?  How reasonable is the involvement of joint contractors in the implementation of the project? Can members of the research team do the work themselves?  How does the research contribute to the integration of Kazakhstan into the global scientific community?  How reasonable are scientific business trips within the project? How do they contribute to the achievement of the goals and expected results of the study?  Any other expert comments on the quality of the research environment and its compliance with the research plan. | (score from 0 to 3) |
| (up to 50 words, only foreign scientists with a Hirsch index of at least 10 shall be taken into account )  1 score - if the participation of foreign scientists and their role in the research is fully justified, the area and level of their competence fully meet the needs of the research plan, and their contribution to the implementation of the program is necessary to achieve the goal.  0.5 score - if the participation of foreign scientists, the field and their level of competence as a whole meet the needs of the program, their role and contribution positively affect the achievement of the research goal, but successful completion of the research is possible without their participation.  0 scores - if the participation of foreign scientists in the program is unreasonable, and (or) the area and level of their qualifications do not meet the needs of the program, and (or) their contribution to achieving the goal of the program is insignificant, or the participation of foreign scientists in the program is not provided. | (score from 0 to 1) |
| 5. | Multidisciplinarity of the research |  | (do not exceed 100 words)  2 points - the project is interdisciplinary in terms of ensuring cooperation between broad scientific fields, an interdisciplinary approach is fully justified in the application and is necessary to achieve the goal of the project.  1 point - the project is interdisciplinary, but the approach presented in the application is not sufficiently substantiated or does not fully meet the project objectives, or the interdisciplinary approach is assumed in terms of the interaction between narrow scientific fields.  0 points - the project is not interdisciplinary, or the approach presented in the application is not justified and does not meet the goal of the project.  Briefly substantiate the opinion of the expert. | |
| Total score | |  | The sum of the total scores for all the above assessment criteria | |
| Rationality of the requested funding | | (do not exceed 250 words)  Based on the main quantitative parameters of the application (for example, the number of researchers, the amount of materials and equipment purchased, the number of business trips, etc.), estimate how much the amount of funding (in monetary and/or in physical measures of the resource) requested by the applicant corresponds to the significance of the project and the actual amount of funds needed to achieve its goal and expected results.  If adjustments are necessary, specify specifically for which items and within what limits adjustments are necessary without prejudice to the achievement of the project objectives. | | |
| Compliance with the priority area of research | | (do not exceed 100 words)  To evaluate how the application corresponds to the priority area and the specialized scientific area it was submitted, briefly substantiate the expert’s opinion. | | |
| Strengths | | (do not exceed 150 words)  Briefly list the key benefits of the research and its characteristics, which will allow achieving the stated objectives of the project. | | |
| Weaknesses | | (do not exceed 150 words)  Briefly list the main shortcomings of the study and the degree of their influence on the achievement of the expected results. Separately highlight the shortcomings that are critical to the project and questioning the achievement of its goal. | | |

Expert’s full name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Expert evaluation on the application under program-targeted funding outside competitive procedures\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**(IRN and name of SSTE object)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№** | **Name of evaluation criteria** | **Overall score** | **Indicator** |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. | The novelty, relevance and perspectivity of the program |  | The novelty and relevance of the proposed scientific and technical level of the program (max 200 words)  How novel are the hypotheses, ideas and expected results of the research? How novel are the scientific and/or methodological problem areas investigated in the program? How novel are the approaches and methods used by the applicant in the research plan? How up-to-date and relevant are they? How relevant is the literature referred to by the authors?  The importance, relevance of the proposed scientific and technical level and the degree to which the program is developed for scientific development (max. 300 words)  How important are the scientific issues addressed by the program? How relevant is the program to global trends? How promising are the hypotheses, ideas and expected results of the research? Is the program capable of being a breakthrough for the advancement of science? How high is the quality of the journals chosen to publish the research results?  Is the quality and quantity of planned publications of the program consistent with the requirements of the tender documentation? How reasonable is the number of articles planned to be published by the applicant? | (0 to 6 points) |
| 2. | Innovativeness of the research plan |  | (max 150 words)  Is the information provided by the applicant to justify the innovativeness of the research plan sufficient to assess the application against this criterion? How well-founded and credible are the applicant's arguments for the innovativeness of the research plan? Other comments from the assessor on the quality of the applicant's justification for the innovativeness of the research plan. | (0 tо 3 points) |
| (max 300 words)  How novel are the expected research results? How novel are the scientific and/or methodological problem areas of the program? How new are the approaches and methods used by the applicant in the research plan? How up-to-date and relevant are they?  How high is the quality of the journals chosen to publish the research results?  How significant are the expected research results in global and sectoral terms?  Other expert comments on the innovativeness of the research plan. | (0 tо 3 points) |
| 3. | Quality and feasibility of the research plan |  | (max 300 words)  How well-founded is the research problem? How clearly has the applicant formulated the research objectives, questions, hypotheses and assumptions? Are the hypotheses (assumptions) scientific?  How sound are the methods used in the study? How appropriate are the methods and approaches to the objectives, goals, hypotheses and expected results? How reliable are the applicant's means of collecting baseline data and their sources? Does the applicant demonstrate consistency between the research questions and data collection methods? How well designed are the experiments for the subsequent statistical processing of the data obtained? How well will the applicant address issues related to the prevention of plagiarism, falsification and fabrication of data, false co-authorship and attribution of results? How well does the applicant address the ethical issues relating to animal and human research? How well did the applicant comply with relevant regulations? Other expert comments on the quality of the proposed research methods and approaches and their relevance to the purpose, objectives and expected results, the quality of the research design. | (0 tо 3 points) |
| (max 250 words)  How realistic are the aims, hypotheses and expected results of the research plan? How are the resources, timing and content of the work being carried out consistent with the aims, objectives, methodology and expected results of the study? What are the risks to successful completion of the study? What is the extent of the risks and how well designed is the applicant to respond to them?  Are there alternative ways and approaches to implement the program? To what extent does the applicant's proposed research design compare favorably with alternatives?  How reasonable is the number of articles the applicant plans to publish? Does the quality and number of publications meet the requirements of the tender documentation? How likely is it that the research results will be accepted for publication in the journals specified in the application? How likely are the results of the research to be published in leading scientific journals from the top quartiles of the bibliographic databases? Other expert comments on the feasibility of the research plan. | (0 tо 3 points) |
| 4. | Relevance and applicability of expected results |  | (max 150 words)  How clearly and comprehensively articulated is the significance of the expected results? How credible and well-founded is the applicant's opinion on the relevance of the expected results? | (0 tо 3 points) |
| (max 300 words)  In which area can the expected results of the study be applied? What is the nature and scope of the problem to be solved by them? Are the expected results competitive with existing equivalents (if there are no equivalents, with existing solutions to a similar problem)? How justified are the social, economic, environmental or other effects of the program? How will the research results affect the level and competitiveness of scientific and technical potential of Kazakhstan? In addition to solving strategically important state tasks, does the successful achievement of the program's goal and objectives contribute to a significant change in the situation in the field of production, science, education? To what extent do the obtained results contribute to the development of strategically important state objectives? Does the program have outputs with significant potential for implementation, commercialisation, creation of products? For a social program, are the potential beneficiaries (improved living and working conditions, etc.) significantly affected by the outcomes of the program? Are the expected results of the program environmentally friendly, energy efficient, competitive? Are the impacts/outcomes of the scientific, science and technology programs feasible to predict? Are the scientific, technical, socio-economic, environmental (if relevant) impacts/outcomes of the programs achievable? What are the ways in which the expected research results will be used? To what extent will they be ready for practical application? What limitations will there be to their application? How likely are the articles published as a result of the project to be regularly cited by other scientists? Other expert comments on the significance of the expected research results. | (0 tо 6 points) |
| 5. | The competence of the applicant and the quality of the research environment |  | (max 150 words)  How complete and well described are the research team and research environment? To what extent does the description allow for an assessment of the relevance of the research plan? | (0 tо 2 points) |
| (max 300 words)  How well justified is the composition of the research team?  How clearly justified is the role of each research team member in the study? To what extent is their contribution necessary to complete the research in accordance with the established purpose, objectives, expected results and proposed research design?  How well qualified and experienced are the study leader and research team members according to the needs and profile of the study? Does the leader regularly publish articles in leading international peer-reviewed scientific journals as principal author (correspondence or first author), including in the direction of the program? To what extent does the role of researchers under 40 years of age (inclusive), undergraduate, graduate and PhD students in the research contribute to their training as researchers? To what extent is their role justified by the research plan?  Other expert comments on the quality of the research team and its relevance to the needs of the research. | (0 to 3 points) |
|  |  |  | (max 300 words)  To what extent does the infrastructure available to the applicant meet the needs of the research plan? To what extent do the research equipment and other tools available to the applicant allow the application of the proposed approaches and research methods? How justified is the use of external infrastructure in the program? How justified is the acquisition of equipment within the program in terms of the purpose, objectives and scope of the program? Are the materials procured by the applicant under the program consistent with the research plan?  Are the beneficiaries sufficiently qualified to operate the purchased equipment? Will the program participants be able to use the purchased equipment effectively, also after the program has ended?  Is the involvement of co-implementers in the implementation of the program justified? Can the members of the research team do the work themselves?  How well does the research contribute to Kazakhstan's integration into the global scientific community?  How well-founded are the scientific visits to the program? How well do they contribute to the study's objectives and expected outcomes?  Other expert comments on the quality of the research environment and its relevance to the research plan. | (0 to 3 points) |
| (up to 50 words, only foreign academics with a Hirsch index of at least 10 are counted)  1 point if the foreign researchers' participation and their role in the research is fully justified, their area of expertise and level of competence fully meet the needs of the research plan and their contribution to the programme is essential to achieve the aim;  0.5 = participation of external researchers, their area of expertise and their level of experience are broadly relevant to the research agenda, their role and input is beneficial to the research objective, but the research can be completed successfully without their involvement;  0 points - if the participation of foreign scholars in the programme is not justified and/or their field and expertise do not meet the needs of the programme, and/or their contribution to the programme is insignificant, or the participation of foreign scholars in the programme is not envisaged. | (0 to 1 points) |
| 6. | Interdisciplinarity of research |  | (up to 100 words)  2 points - if the programme is interdisciplinary in terms of cooperation between broad research areas, the interdisciplinary approach is fully justified in the application and is necessary to achieve the objective of the programme;  1 point - if the programme is interdisciplinary but the approach presented in the application is not sufficiently justified or does not fully meet the objective of the programme, or the interdisciplinary approach is intended in terms of collaboration between narrow research areas;  0 points - if the programme is not interdisciplinary, or the approach presented in the application is not justified and does not meet the objective of the programme. Justify briefly the expert's opinion. | |
| Final score | |  | The sum of the total scores for all the above evaluation criteria. | |
| Reasonableness of the funding requested | | (max. 250 words)  Based on the basic quantitative parameters of the application (e.g., number of researchers, amount of materials and equipment to be purchased, number of missions, etc.), assess whether the amount of funding requested by the applicant matches the relevance of the programme and the actual funds needed to achieve its objectives and expected results. If adjustments are necessary, specify in which items and to what extent adjustments are necessary without compromising the objectives of the programme. | | |
| Relevance to the priority area | | (max. 100 words)  Assess whether the application corresponds to the priority field and the specialised scientific field in which it has been submitted, briefly justifying the expert's opinion. | | |
| Strengths | | (max 150 words)  List briefly the key benefits of the study and its characteristics that will achieve the stated aim of the program. | | |
| Weaknesses | | (max 150 words)  Briefly list the main weaknesses of the study and the extent to which they affect the achievement of the expected results. Separately, highlight the shortcomings that are critical to the implementation of the programme and that call into question the achievement of its objective. | | |
| Full name (if any) of the expert \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | | |

**Expert evaluation on the interim report under program budgeting № \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**(IRN and name of SSTE object)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of evaluation criteria** | | **Score**  **(0 to 9)** | **Comments from the expert/expert group** |
| 1. | Programme management quality |  | Is the composition of the research team reasonable in number and competence to meet the objectives of the programme? Is the purchased research equipment being used? Are young researchers involved in the implementation of the programme as planned in the application? How scientifically sound and evidence-based are the main research findings? Are they new and important for subsequent publication as articles in leading international journals or for other forms of application? |
| 2. | Assessing the quality of the methodology used for scientific research |  | Assess the scientific validity and relevance of the applied methodology to the specifics of the research. Do the methods used allow you to test the hypotheses and achieve the objective of the programme? Are they the most effective and do they provide reliable data? Are the experiments carried out in multiple parallels, followed by statistical processing of the data, including calculation of standard deviations, probability of the null hypothesis correctness, etc.? Are the error bars on experimentally obtained plots set aside? Do the methods used comply with the standards and principles of scientific ethics? |
| 3. | Assessing the achievement of the programme's objectives |  | Are project/programme objectives being implemented according to the previously approved research plan? (ahead of schedule, reasonably modified, unreasonably deviated from the plan). Is there any doubt that the programme will not achieve its objectives? Does the programme therefore need to be discontinued? |
| Total score (sum of scores according to evaluation criteria) | |  |  |
| Strengths | |  |  |
| Weaknesses | |  |  |

Full name *(if any) of the expert* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Expert evaluation on the final report under grant or program research funding\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**(IRN and name of SSTE object)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of evaluation criteria** | | **Score**  **(0 to 9)** | **Comments from the expert/expert group** |
| 1. | Novelty of the findings |  | (7-9 points)  New results are obtained, new theory, new regularity is discovered; the phenomenon is studied in a new or first time: the structure of the content, its essence is revealed. The novelty of the results is confirmed by at least one article in an international scientific journal from the first quartile of bibliographic databases (with an individual project registration number). A fundamentally new device or method allowing for the creation of a fundamentally new product is invented. The invention is patented or patentable. |
| (4-6 points)  Some general regularities, methods are obtained, a new connection between known facts is found, new information is obtained, which significantly reduced the uncertainty of existing knowledge, an effective solution is found as a result of extending the known provisions to new objects. Significant, fundamental improvement of the process, method and (or) development is made, a partial rational modification (with signs of novelty) is made. The novelty of the results is confirmed by at least one article in an international scientific journal from the first three quartiles of the bibliographic databases (indicating the individual registration number of the project). |
| (0-3 points)  The result is derived from simple generalizations, analysis of factor relationships, extension of known principles to new entities. Description of individual factors, extension of previously obtained results, abstracts are given. |
| 2. | Level of research |  | (7-9 points)  Performing complex theoretical calculations, testing on a large volume of experimental data in several parallels, followed by statistical processing. |
| (4-6 points)  Low complexity of calculations, testing on a small amount of experimental data. |
| (0-3 points)  Theoretical calculations are straightforward, no experiment was carried out. |
| 3. | Prospective use of the results |  | (7-9 points)  The results of the project can be applied in many scientific fields, have exceptional importance for world science, which is confirmed by at least one article in an international scientific journal from the first quartile of bibliographic databases (indicating the individual registration number of the project). There is commercial potential: competitive marketable products, processes or services can be produced if the results are commercialized. |
| (4-6 points)  The obtained results are important for priority scientific areas of Kazakhstan, which is confirmed by at least one article in an international scientific journal from the first three quartiles of the bibliographic databases (indicating the individual registration number of the project). The results can be used in the development of new technical solutions, have the potential for implementation in practice, production in Kazakhstan. |
| (0-3 points)  The results can be used to develop further research and development. |
| 4. | Completeness of results |  | (7-9 points)  Research results are published in international peer-reviewed scientific journals indexed in one of the leading international citation systems (bibliographic databases), indicating an individual project registration number. The number of articles and level of journals are as planned in the project application. The results are protected by intellectual property rights. |
| (4-6 points)  Recommendations, detailed analysis, proposals are presented. Number of articles published in foreign peer-reviewed scientific journals indexed in one of the leading bibliographic databases, indicating individual project registration number, and level of journals in which they were published, is less than planned in the project application. The terms of reference for the developmental work is available. |
| (0-3 points)  Reviewed, collected information, no articles in foreign peer-reviewed scientific journals indexed in one of the leading bibliographic databases were published. |
| Total score (sum of scores according to evaluation criteria) | |  |  |
| Strengths | |  | |
| Weaknesses | |  | |

Full name *(if any) of the expert* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Expert evaluation on the work nominated for the State Prize of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the field of science and technology\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**(IRN and name of SSTE object)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of evaluation criteria** | | **Score (0 to 9)** | **Comments from the expert/expert group** |
| 1. | Degree of scientific novelty of the findings with world-class standards, relevance of the research carried out |  |  |
| 2. | Evaluation of the methodology used for scientific research |  |  |
| 3. | Assessment of the scientific and practical relevance of the main research findings |  |  |
| 4. | Assessment of the contribution of the work to the development of science and technology |  |  |
| 5. | Total score (sum of scores according to evaluation criteria) |  |  |
| Strengths | |  |  |
| Weaknesses | |  |  |

Full name (if any) of the expert \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Appendix №7

to the Agreement №\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

on the provision of foreign expert the services

of State Scientific and Technical Evaluation

dated\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_, 20\_\_

СИСТЕМА ОЦЕНОК ОБЪЕКТА ГНТЭ/

SCORING SYSTEM OF THE RESEARCH PROPOSALS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Пороговая оценка/**  Threshold score | **Баллы/**  Points | **Оценка/**  Evaluation | **Описание оценок с указанием сильных и слабых сторон/**  Description of grades containing indication of strengths and weaknesses |
| Высокая/  High | 9 | Исключительно/  Exceptional | Без слабых сторон/  No weaknesses have been determined |
| 8 | Выдающееся/  Outstanding | С пренебрежительными слабыми сторонами/  Contains few minor shortcomings |
| 7 | Отлично/  Excellent | С некоторыми незначительными слабыми сторонами/  Contains some minor shortcomings |
| Средняя/  Medium | 6 | Очень хорошо/  Very good | С многочисленными незначительными слабыми сторонами/  Contains a lot of minor shortcomings |
| 5 | Хорошо/  Good | С некоторыми сильными сторонами и умеренными слабыми сторонами /  Has some strengths and moderate weaknesses |
| 4 | Удовлетворительно/  Satisfactory | С некоторыми сильными сторонами, но с одной значительной слабой стороной/  Has some strong points, but with one significant weak point |
| Низкая/  Low | 3 | Слабо/  Unsatisfactory | С незначительными сильными сторонами и многочисленными слабыми сторонами/  Has few strengths and contains numerous weakness |
| 2 | Неудовлетворительно/  Poor | Без сильных сторон и значительными слабыми сторонами/  Has minor strengths and a lot of weaknesses |
| 1 | Крайне неудовлетворительно/  Failure | Без сильных сторон /  Has no strengths |
|  | 0 |  | Отсутствует/Absent |

Appendix №8

to the Agreement №\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

on the provision of foreign expert the services of State Scientific and Technical Evaluation

dated\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_, 20\_\_

**ИИН/БИН**

|  |
| --- |
| 110740017735 |

**Заказчик АО «Национальный центр государственной научно-технической экспертизы»**/ Customer, JSC “National Center of Science and Technology Evaluation”

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**050026, Республика Казахстан, Алматы, ул. Богенбай батыра, 221**

050026, Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty, Bogenbai batyr st, 221

**Исполнитель $EXPERT\_NAME$, $FULL\_ADDRESS\_RU$, контактный телефон: $PHONE$, электронная почта: $EMAIL$.**

Contractor $EXPERT\_NAME$, $FULL\_ADDRESS\_EN$, phone: $PHONE$, email: $EMAIL$.

**Договор (контракт) от $AGREEMENT\_DATE$ года №$AGREEMENT\_NUMBER$**

Agreement (contract) dated $AGREEMENT\_DATE$ №$AGREEMENT\_NUMBER$

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Номер документа**/ Document № | **Дата составления**/ Date of compilation |
|  |  |

**АКТ ВЫПОЛНЕННЫХ РАБОТ (ОКАЗАННЫХ УСЛУГ)/**

REPORT OF THE SERVICES RENDERED

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Номер по порядку**/ Numerical order | **Наименование работ** (услуг)/ Title of works (services) | **Дата выполнения работ (оказания услуг)**/ Date of execution of works (services provision) | **Сведения о наличии отчета о маркетинговых исследованиях, консультационных и прочих услуг (дата, номер, количество страниц)**/  Information about report(s) (if any) on marketing research, consulting and other services (date, number, number of pages) | **Единица измерения**/ Unit | **Выполнено работ (оказано услуг**)/ Work completed (services rendered) | | |
| **Количество**/ Quantity | **цена за единицу**, Price per unit  $CURRENCY\_NAME\_RU\_PLURAL$ | **Стоимость**/ Cost, $CURRENCY\_NAME\_RU\_PLURAL$ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | **Проведение ГНТЭ**/  Conducting SSTE |  |  | **шт**./ pcs |  | $PRICE$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Итого**/ Total |  | $PRICE$ |  |

**Сведения об использовании запасов, полученных от заказчика**

Evidence on use of reserves, received from the Customer \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***наименование, количество, стоимость*** */ title , quantity, cost*

**Приложение: Перечень документации, в том числе отчет(ы) о маркетинговых, научных исследованиях, консультационных и прочих услугах (обязательны при его (их) наличии) на \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_страниц**

Annex: List of documents, including report(s) on marketing, scientific research, consulting and other services (required if there is (are) any) on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ page(s)

**Сдал (Исполнитель)** **Эксперт**/ Submitted (Contractor) **Expert** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/**$EXPERT\_NAME$**

**М.П.**/ Stamp

**Принял (Заказчик)** **Президент**/ Accepted (Customer) **President** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/**А. Ибраев / A. Ibrayev**

**М.П./** Stamp