

Office of the Government of the Czech Republic

File No.: 1417/2013-RVV

Methodology
of Evaluation of Research Organizations
and
Evaluation of Finished Programmes
(valid for years 2013 - 2015)

Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS.....	6
III.	INPUTS FOR RESULTS EVALUATION	7
IV.	RESULT EVALUATION RULES.....	9
	IV.1. Evaluation procedure	9
	IV.2. Solving discrepancies	9
	IV.3 Consolidation rules.....	10
	IV.4. Setting the number of the submitter's domestic authors	10
	IV.5 Assigning result score to submitters.....	11
V.	EVALUATION OF THE PUBLICATION RESULTS – PILLAR I.....	11
	V.1. Scored results.....	11
	V.2. Evaluation of J type results (article in specialist periodical)	12
	V.3. Evaluation of D type results (article in proceedings)	13
VI.	PEER REVIEW OF SELECTED TYPES OF PUBLICATION RESULT – SUBPILLAR I.....	14
	VI.1. General rules	14
	V.1.22 The evaluation process	15
VII.	EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF SELECTED RESULTS – PILLAR II.	18
	VII.1. Bonus reward for ERC projects	18
	VII.2. Evaluation of the quality of selected results.....	18
	VII.3. Results created by several cooperating RO	19
	VII.4. Evaluation of the results	19
	VII.5 Establishing the panels.....	20
	VII.6. Calculation of the point score	20
	VII.7. Dividing the points among faculties.....	21
	VII.8. The method of point allocation in case of the change of the share allotted to Pillar II.	21
VIII.	Evaluation of patents and non-publication results of the applied research – Pillar III.....	22
IX.	Evaluation phases.....	25
X.	EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF FINISHED PROGRAMMES OF RESEARCH, EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	28
	X.1. Initial data for summary evaluation of finished programmes	28

X.2 The procedure of summary evaluation of finished programmes	29
X.3. Outputs of the summary evaluation of finished programmes.....	29
XI. EVALUATION OUPUTS	30
XII. RULES OF VERIFIABILITY OF REPORTED RESULTS.....	31
XIII. CONCLUSION	32
XIV. ANNEXES.....	33

I. INTRODUCTION

This regulation fulfils the obligation of the Research, Development and Innovation Council (RVVI) stipulated by the Act No. 130/2002 Coll., on the Support of Research, Experimental Development and Innovation from Public Funds and on the Amendment to Some Related Acts (the Act on the Support of Research and Development), as amended (hereinafter only the “Act”). According to §35 par. 2 c) the RVVI has to ensure the “preparation of the Methodology of Evaluation of the Results of Research Organizations and Results of Finished Programmes and its presentation to the government” and further according to § 35 par. 2 d) ensure the “evaluation of results of research organizations and finished programmes according to the Methodology of Evaluation of the Results of Research Organizations and Results of Finished Programmes approved by the government”.

The Methodology of Evaluation of the Results of Research Organizations and Results of Finished Programmes (hereinafter the “Methodology”) is valid for the years 2013, 2014 and 2015. After 2015 a new system of R&D&I evaluation should be implemented. This Methodology aims to remove several criticized shortcomings of the current result evaluation system, which are causing inefficiency in the funding of research. Contrary to the previous methodologies it does not include explicit rules for setting the institutional support directed to the development of research organizations (RO). The Methodology, in accordance with the § 5a par. 2 b) of the Act, constitutes only one of the basic documents, which the RVVI uses for the preparation of its draft state budget for the R&D&I area.

The Methodology is structured into three connected pillars, which will be applied in coordination:

Pillar I: Filed evaluation of publication results. The Methodology stipulates relevant result types for each field group and their eventual maximum shares in the point values. Some of the results in certain field groups are not evaluated at all, in other groups there is a set percentage limit for them within the point total of this field group.

The evaluation in Pillar I. is complemented by the so-called Subpillar I., which defines the process and method of the peer review for selected result groups, i.e. books, chapters in books and articles in non-impact reviewed periodicals.

Pillar II: Evaluation of the quality of selected results. Each institution shall submit a limited number of selected results for expert evaluation. The Field Verification and Evaluation Panel (OVHP) with a significant share of foreign experts will choose a maximum of 20% of the best results within each field group, which deserve a special reward. Apart from that special reward for excellence will be awarded to research organizations, whose employees succeeded in receiving ERC (European research Council) projects.

Pillar III: Evaluation of patents and non-publication results of the applied research. Contrary to the current practice of flat rate scoring of all non-publication results the flat rate remains only for the patent type results. For other results the score will be based on the financial support from the applied research projects and the contractual research.

The scoring according to this Methodology will be applied to results with application date of 2012 and newer. The process of evaluation of results submitted earlier is described in chapter III. of the Methodology. In 2013 only Pillars I. and III. will be applied. Pillar II. and the complete version of Subpillar I. will be published by 2014. The transition year 2013 and the gradual launch of other pillars

will enable early preparation of research organizations for newly implemented processes defined in this Methodology, create a time period for appropriate updates of the R&D&I Information System and its support programmes and at the same time will not interfere with the on-going process of data gathering.

The RVVI will cover the OVHP expenses related to the supervision of results and translations (if necessary). The providers of support will not be called upon to perform these tasks.

II. RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

According to the Commission Regulation (EC) No. 800/2008 a research organization (RO) is “an entity, such as a university or research institute, irrespective of its legal status (organised under public or private law) or way of financing, whose primary goal is to conduct fundamental research, industrial research or experimental development and to disseminate their its results by way of teaching, publication or technology transfer; all profits must be reinvested in these activities, the dissemination of their results or teaching; undertakings that can exert influence upon such an organisation, for instance in their capacity as shareholders or members of the organisation, shall enjoy no preferential access to the research capacities of such an organisation or to the research results generated by it”.

According to §2 par 2 d) of the Act these are established research organizations (according to Act No. 341/2005 Coll.), universities (according to Act No. 111/1998 Coll.), semi-budgetary organizations (according to another Act and Act No. 250/2000 Coll.), organization units (according to the Act No. 219/2000 Coll. and 250/2000 Coll.) and other organizations fulfilling the criteria according to § 18 of the Act.¹

The list of RO included in the Evaluation is annually updated based on the written report of the appropriate support providers, who are obliged to submit proposals for inclusion of a specific subject among the RO by 30th May of the given year. By the same date the providers state in writing whether it is necessary to exclude from the registry any of the RO that are already included in the group of institutional support beneficiaries.

Only those RO may be included in the evaluation of RO results, which are eligible to receive institutional support according to the government-approved proposal of Czech state budget expenditures on R&D&I in the year the evaluation takes place, with a possible addition of RO according to the results of discussions between the RVVI and providers about the draft budget for the following year² and further those RO, where the providers apply for it due to the calculation of the amount of directed support (e.g. specific university research), or because of the evaluation of a claim of a “new” RO for inclusion into the process of institutional support allocation.

In the case of a university an evaluation of all the university’s results shall be performed, which includes all its organizational units (faculties, university institutes and other organizational units). At the same time the evaluation shall be performed for individual organizational units of the universities.

For state organizational units the evaluation shall be performed separately for each of their parts.

¹ Subjects fulfilling the criteria for research organizations according to the Community Framework for State Aid for Research and Development and Innovation (published in the Official Journal of the EU on 30th December 2006) are listed as RO registered for the purposes of CEA, CEP, CEZ and RIV.

² The provider must submit its proposal for inclusion of additional RO together with the proposal of expenditures from its budget chapter for the following year (e.g. for the 2013 evaluation with the proposed budget for 2014 etc.) including the results of the discussions with the Office for the Protection of Competition. The process of including additional RO and its necessities are published at www.vyzkum.cz.

III. INPUTS FOR RESULTS EVALUATION

The source of data about the results is the R&D&I Information System (R&D&I IS) – the Registry of Information about Results (RIV). The RO Evaluation will include all records of the results filed in the RIV regardless of the type of the research activity or the source of funding. A decisive indicator for the placement of individual records about the results in the Evaluation is the year of application recorded in RIV. The application year is the year when this results was published in its final form³, implemented etc., not the year when it was filed in the R&D&I IS. This data is entered for each result record in the RIV. In case of an ambiguous application year in the RIV the consolidated application year shall be used according to the following rules.

Evaluated data. The Evaluation in the given year will include all applied results according to the table below, the application year of which (or the consolidated application year) is within the interval of the appropriate evaluated years.

Evaluation year	Application year	
	from 1 st January of the year	until 31 st December of the year
2013	2008	2012
2014	2009	2013
2015	2010	2014

The valid definitions of the individual result types, registered in the RIV, are included in Annex 2. The transfer of data about results(or their changes) to RIV as well as their removal are subject to binding rules approved by the RVVI and published at www.vyzkum.cz.

The result will be included in the Evaluation of the RO, which is its submitter. The submitter is the RO, where the result was created, whose employees or students participated in its creation and are listed as its domestic authors and have agreed with the submission of the result by the given RO. Should the result have e.g. four authors from three different RO, the result shall be submitted by all three RO (the method of determining the share of RO in the result is described later).

The domestic author of the result, according to RIV, is an author, who achieved the result within a labour or study relation with the submitter, i.e. the subject, who submits the result or an organizational unit of the subject, who submits the result. The labour relation must be related to the research and

³ For J-type results – some magazine publishers use preliminary publishing of results in an electronic form (e.g. E-Pub, On-line first etc.). This designation means that these results have been accepted into print and that the result will be included in one of the future standard print or electronic issues of the magazine. In these cases the decisive application year (year of final publishing) is the year when the result was actually included in a standard issue of the magazine. The publication of the result in the E-Pub, On-line first and similar forms is not taken as the final publishing form – **in this case the result is not applied**.

development activity within the meaning of the law, based on which the result has been achieved. The decisive criterion for registering the author as a domestic author is whether the labour or study relation was in effect at the time of the creation of the result, not the application year. Another necessary condition for the registration of the author among domestic authors is his affiliation listed in publications, which includes affiliations (always required in J-type results). This is also decisive when dealing with the disputes of domestic authors.

The transfer of results. Individual submitters transfer the data into RIV via appropriate support providers, who are responsible for the correctness of the transferred data. The providers' duty is to check the existence of the reported result, correctness of the result's match with a certain result type and its correct field classification (see e.g. § 12, § 13 and other provisions of the Act).

The results, which have already been evaluated (and checked) based on valid methodologies, i.e. based on the finished and approved Evaluation, transfer their non-zero score into the next evaluation year. If the result has been newly submitted into the RIV, this rule shall not be used and the result will be evaluated and checked again. Those evaluated results, which did not receive any points, may be additionally re-evaluated in the following years.

Reasons for exclusion of a result may be the following:

- a) false data – incorrect or inaccurate data about the result transferred to the RIV. Only the incorrect data related to the result will be removed, not all its records in the RIV;
- b) the result does not match the definition valid at the time the results were transferred to the RIV – all records about the result will be removed from RIV, which might have been supplied by various submitters, although they have been evaluated in the past.

Additional provision of the result. A result may be additionally transferred into RIV even if the has a earlier application year than the current data gathering year. Such result shall always be evaluated according to this Methodology (not according to the Methodology valid in the application year). The scoring process is as follows:

- a) The result has not yet been entered into RIV (i.e. has not been submitted by another submitter) and the result has a non-zero score according to Annex 1. The score shall be normalized by the same coefficient as the results of the same type in the same field group with the same application year.
- b) The result has already been entered into RIV (i.e. has been submitted by another submitter) and the result has a non-zero score according to Annex 1. A new percentage recalculation of the original normalized score shall be performed.
- c) In other cases the given result type receives 0 points (although there might be a situation where another submitter received points for this result and carries this ratio into another evaluation).

IV. RESULT EVALUATION RULES

IV.1. Evaluation procedure

The R&D&I IS operator selects the evaluated data from RIV, which were submitted in time periods according to the schedule provided in the Annex and included in the R&D&I IS and subsequently processes the data in several consequent steps:

- Checking of the accordance of data records of reported results in RIV with the valid structure of RIV data description in the given year via technical and programme means. If a discrepancy is discovered in the transferred data, these records about transferred results shall be excluded from further evaluation process. The list of such results shall be included in Table 1 and the results will be designated for data correction by the given submitter.
- Merging of identical results – if a result is shown multiple times, i.e. a case when the same result data has been submitted repeatedly. During the merging process each group of identical results is assigned an ID code. In the case the result has been transferred repeatedly, Table 3 will list the repeated identical results with the same ID code value of the merged result.
- Selection of results, which show discrepancies after the merging process, i.e. data shortcomings due to which it is not possible to evaluate them. These results will be listed in Table 2 and will be designated for data correction by the given submitter.
- Each submitter is only responsible for the correctness of the data in the RIV result record made by him.
- Tables 1 and 2 will be according to the schedule provided by remote access to individual submitters via the appropriate providers.

IV.2. Solving discrepancies

Individual submitters transfer via the appropriate providers complete and corrected RIV records to the R&D&I IS operator in the period listed in the schedule, which is included in the Annex. This enables the correction of specific data with discovered discrepancies. If new records will be added to the RIV during this evaluation phase, these records will not be included in the on-going RO evaluation and will be evaluated in the next evaluation.

The discrepancies, which are being primarily watched, are the occurrences of different records of an identical result with the following data, which make its further processing impossible:

- a) non-uniform result type for J, B, C or D;
- b) non-uniform ISSN or ISBN code;
- c) non-uniform result language;
- d) non-uniform application year;
- e) non-uniform total number of authors or number of domestic author within the submitter.

Also listed will be the occurrences of different records of the same result, where one of the authors of one result has been listed as a domestic author by two or more submitters.

Possible situations will be solved by the following procedure:

- 1) if the result discrepancy originated due to records being submitted by two or more submitters:

- the submitter corrects the incorrect data, i.e. the discrepancy will be removed (and the result evaluated);
 - one submitter states that his record is correct and other submitters will not react – the result will be evaluated and credited only to the first submitter. Records by submitters, who did not react, will be removed from the Evaluation.
- 2) If the conflict shall persist, i.e. the submitter will insist on the original data, the consolidation process will take place (see further), which may result in the removal of the result from the RIV.

IV. 3 Consolidation rules

During the consolidation of result occurrences, if even after the request of RIV correcting batches or after a check by the Council and its advisory bodies and the OVHP (see Subpillar I.) some data remain ambiguous, the so-called “consolidated values” will be used for the below listed data. In the case that a physical check is performed by the Council’s expert and advisory body (so-called expert commission), which gives its statement to the disputed data, the consolidated value proposed by this body shall be used. The expert commission may propose to the R&D&I IS operator to remove the incorrect record from the RIV. If the expert commission does not give its opinion to the data, the consolidated values shall be determined as follows:

- **consolidated result application year** for the group of identical result occurrences: in case of non-uniform data the most frequent value shall be used (in case of several such values the highest of them shall be used);
- **consolidated total number of authors** for the group of identical result occurrences: in case of non-uniform data the most frequent value shall be used (in case of several such values the highest of them shall be used);
- **consolidated number of domestic authors** for the subgroup of occurrences of the identical result with the same submitter: in case of non-uniform data the most frequent value shall be used (in case of several such values the highest of them shall be used);
- **consolidated number of pages of the book** for the group of identical B and C result type occurrences: in case of non-uniform data the most frequent value shall be used (in case of several such values the highest of them shall be used);
- **consolidated number of pages of the result** for the group of identical J, C and D result type occurrences: in case of non-uniform data the most frequent value shall be used (in case of several such values the highest of them shall be used);
- **consolidated indicator of the language’s affiliation to global languages** for the group of identical result occurrences: in case of non-uniform affiliation of the language of the result occurrences to global languages the most frequent value shall be used; in case of two and more records the last submitted shall be used;
- **consolidated field group of the result** for the group of identical result occurrences: in case of non-uniform affiliation of the result’s field to a field group the most frequent value shall be used; in case of two and more different records the last submitted record shall be used.

IV. 4. Setting the number of the submitter’s domestic authors

In case that the result is submitted by one submitter or if none of the authors is listed as a domestic author of several submitters, the number of domestic authors of the submitter is equal to the number of authors, which this submitter declared to be domestic authors.

If one of the authors is rightfully declared to be a domestic author by several submitters, then each of these authors is counted towards each of these submitters as a proportion, which is equal to the inverted value of the number of submitters, who stated that this author is their domestic author.

IV.5 Assigning result score to submitters

If the result was created only by authors listed by one or more submitters as domestic authors, the submitter will be awarded the share of the result as a ratio of domestic authors, who took part in the creation of the result at this submitter, to the total number of authors of the result. However, should the sum of these shares of submitters of one result exceed 1, the result shall be divided among the submitters according to the original ratio so that the sum of the recalculated shares of individual submitters equals 1.

If the result was created in cooperation with other (domestic and foreign) authors (i.e. authors, who were not listed as domestic for any of the submitters in RIV), each additional author is counted with $\frac{1}{2}$ value during the share calculation (e.g. if the result is created by two authors, one is domestic at a certain submitter and one is foreign, this domestic submitter is awarded $\frac{2}{3}$ of the score of this result).

However, if the number of additional authors was so large, that the total score for all submitters is less than $\frac{1}{10}$ of the original score, then $\frac{1}{10}$ of the original score shall be divided among the submitters (e.g. if the result is created by 2 domestic authors of Czech RO and 40 foreign authors, each Czech author receives 5% of the original score).

Each RO receives the shares in results, which the given RO submitted into RIV via a provider or in results, which were submitted to RIV via a provider by a subject, which the RO is a successor of.

V. EVALUATION OF THE PUBLICATION RESULTS – PILLAR I.

V.1. Scored results

The following result types are evaluated within the Pillar I.:

- article in specialist periodical (J type) with internal classification:
 - J_{imp} – article in a periodical registered in the Web of Science (hereinafter only „WoS“),
 - J_{SC} - article in a source registered in SCOPUS, which is not registered in WoS,
 - J_{neimp} – article in a reviewed periodical in the ERIH database, which is not registered in WoS or SCOPUS,
 - J_{rec} – article in a reviewed Czech periodical, which is not registered in WoS, SCOPUS or ERIH;
- 2) specialist book (B type);
- 3) chapter in a specialist book (C type);

4) article in proceedings (D type).⁴

Individual result types will receive points according to Annex 1. Inclusion of the result in an appropriate field group will be based on the result's field listed in RIV. For each field group (the classification of individual fields into field groups is included in Annex 7) there are set result types for evaluation, other result types will not be taken into account.

Other result types listed in Annex 2 are not included in Evaluation within Pillar I.

V.2. Evaluation of J type results (article in specialist periodical)

When processing data about the specialist periodical for the purposes of the Evaluation the ISSN recorded in RIV will be used exclusively for identification and will not be converted to ISSN of the print and electronic version (from 2014 it will be possible to list both ISSN in RIV, if they exist). The UT ISI or DOI codes will also be used for identification, if they are listed in RIV.

If the specialist periodical is a scientific journal included in the WoS⁵ and the article has the “Article”, “Review” or “Letter” (in 2013 also “Proceedings Paper”) indicator in the WoS database, then such result will receive a point score for J_{imp} .

If the specialist periodical is a reviewed scientific journal not included in the WoS and is registered in the SCOPUS⁶ database and the article has the “Article”, “Review” or “Letter” (in 2013 also “Conference Paper”) indicator in the WoS database, then such result will receive a point score for J_{sc} .

If the specialist periodical is a reviewed scientific journal registered in the ERIH⁷ database, which is not included in the above listed databases, the result will receive a point score for J_{neimp} .

If the specialist periodical is a reviewed scientific journal (meets the criteria for J type result), which is not included in any of the above listed databases, the result shall receive a point score of the J_{rec} category, provided the periodical will be put on the list of non-reviewed non-impacted periodicals issued in the Czech Republic.⁸ The J_{rec} result is only evaluated in the SHVa and SHVb field groups (see Annex 8). Part of the evaluation of the J_{rec} result is its physical verification by the appropriate OVHP (see chapter VI.2.).

If the result is published in a periodical, which is registered in more than one database at the same time, the point score will be awarded using a process in the above listed order.

The used databases register the year in which the periodical was put in the database, the same applies for the year of the removal of the periodical from the database or when it ceased to be published. If

⁴ The proceedings must be registered in the database Conference Proceedings Citation Index – Science or Social Science & Humanities (formerly ISI Proceedings) of the Thomson Reuters (New York, USA) Company, or in the SCOPUS database.

⁵ IF values and the list of journals with IF will be provided from the Journal Citation Report database of the Thomson Reuters Company (New York, USA). The IF value will always be related to the application year. A journal is a regularly issued periodical, which has only a ISSN record. Results that do not meet these two conditions are included in the D type results.

⁶ The SCOPUS database (<http://www.scopus.com/scopus/home.url>). The source for the J_{sc} result category is a regularly issued periodical included in the SCOPUS list, which has **only** a ISSN record and the article contains indicators valid for J_{sc} . Results that do not meet these conditions are included in the D type results.

⁷ The ERIH database (<http://www.esf.org/research-areas/humanities/erih-european-reference-index-for-the-humanities.html>).

⁸ The list of non-reviewed non-impacted periodicals issued in the Czech Republic including the information about its origin and validity is published at www.vyzkum.cz.

the J result – article in a specialist periodical – is applied in the year when the periodical was not included in the appropriate database, it shall not be evaluated according to this database.

If in case of the J result – article in a specialist periodical – it will be found that the provided application year does not match the period between the year the periodical’s publishing started and the year it ended, this result will be removed from the evaluation as an incorrect record.

V.3. Evaluation of D type results (article in proceedings)

The D type results are evaluated only in the field groups defined in Annex 8. Only articles in proceedings registered in the WoS or SCOPUS databases longer than 2 pages are eligible for evaluation.

If the proceedings are registered in the SCOPUS database as a Conference Proceedings or Book Series source type, have the ISBN or ISBN as well the ISSN, they are awarded a non-zero value of the SJR indicator and the article is labelled as a Conference Paper or Conference Review, the article is then evaluated according to Annex 1.

If the proceedings are not registered in the SCOPUS database but are indexed in the Conference Proceedings Citation Index of the Thomson Reuters Company, have the ISBN or ISBN as well the ISSN and the article has the Proceedings Paper indicator, the article is then evaluated according to Annex 1.

If the result is published in proceedings, which are registered in both databases, the point score will be awarded using a process in the above listed order.

During the processing of the data about the proceedings identification will be based exclusively on the ISSN/ISBN codes or the UT ISI code of the article. Identification by proceedings name will not be used.⁹

⁹ Conversion of different values of the ISSN code for the electronic and print version of the same proceedings will be ensured via the ISSN→ ISSN-L convertor published by the ISSN International Centre.

VI. PEER REVIEW OF SELECTED TYPES OF PUBLICATION RESULT – SUBPILLAR I.

The subject of peer review within the Subpillar I. are results of the B type (specialist book), C type (chapter in a specialist book) and J_{rec} (article in a reviewed specialist periodical).

VI.1. General rules

A specialist book fulfilling the criteria of a B type result will receive a score between 4 and 120 points, whereas the fulfilment of the basic criteria shall be awarded with 4 points. This score will be increased by the RVVI based on the proposal by OVHP. The increment will be implemented so that the total share of points awarded to B and C type results in the given field does not exceed the set share of points in all results within the field (see Annex 8). For the J_{rec} type results only a physical verification is performed (check whether the contents match the definition), for the awarding of points see chapter V.2.

The score of a C type result shall be set as a point value of a corresponding B type result multiplied by the chapter factor. The chapter factor will be set by the OVHP so that the sum of chapter factors of a given book does not exceed 100% and the factors of individual chapters reflect the contribution of each chapter to the whole book. Should the OVHP fail to do so the chapter factor shall be set as the ratio of the number of pages of the chapter to the number of pages of the whole book according to the information from RIV. In case that the sum of the stated number of pages of all chapters exceeds the number of pages of the book, the chapter factor shall be equal to 1/10 or 1/(number of chapters) if the number of chapters exceeds 10.

The score of the C type result (chapter) shall be counted towards the submitter only if he simultaneously did not submit a B type result (book), which already includes this C type result. If one submitter submitted a B type result (book) containing the chapters, which were submitted by other submitters, the score the first submitter received is reduced by the number of points the other submitters received for their chapters.

A B or C type result will be without a score if its ISBN is included in the Conference Proceedings Citation Index – Science or Social Science & Humanities (formerly ISI Proceedings), or if the source type listed in the SCOPUS database for this ISBN is Book Series or Conference Proceedings.

Only publications available at the National Library (NK) will be evaluated. In case of foreign publishers the submitter supplies them to the NK at his own cost. In case of evaluation of electronic books (on-line), which the NK does not register, their evaluation is conditioned by a registration in international book or digital registers (e.g. ISBN or DOI), proof of existence (e.g. an html link) and providing access to the electronic book or a physical copy of it.

The evaluation process in 2013 will only include physical verifications (fulfilment of the definition of the result of the original research) of results submitted in 2012. The verification process will remove results, which do not meet the definition according to the Methodology. These verifications will be performed in all field groups for those relevant result types, which are eligible for evaluation. The results will be awarded points according to Annex 1, Table 1.1. The support for physical verifications shall be provided by the RVVI secretariat.

V.1.22 The evaluation process

Establishing the OVHP

The process of verification and evaluation of the J_{rec} , B and C type results is performed by OVHP. The process of their establishment observes the following principles:

- One panel is established for each field group, for which the J_{rec} , B and C type results is relevant (see Annex).
- The minimum number of panel members is set as an integer of 1/20 of the number of evaluated B type results during the previous year in the given field group with a minimum of 5.
- Candidates for OVHP membership are proposed by RO and discussed by the RVVI's expert and advisory bodies, which then submit their proposal to the RVVI according to the field affiliation. The selection of OVHP members is discussed and approved by the RVVI. A member's term of office is four years. The OVHP membership is terminated upon the end of the term of office, resignation from the post, removal from office or upon the death of the member. Members of the OVHP must meet expert and moral criteria for their work and if during their activity it should be discovered that they do not meet them, they may be removed from office by the RVVI.
- The following persons cannot be nominated or appointed as members of OVHP: members of statutory bodies of RO, members of RVVI expert commissions, members of KHV or members of panels or other bodies of the Grant Agency and Technological Agency of the Czech Republic.
- Members of the appropriate OVHP elect the OVHP presiding person from among themselves.
- The list of OVHP members is published at www.vyzkum.cz.
- Other necessities of the OVHP activities are regulated by the OVHP Statute and Rules of Procedure, which are approved by RVVI.

The evaluation

Evaluation shall be done according to the following principles

- 1) Each result shall be evaluated by no less than two OVHP members.
- 2) The allocation of results to evaluators shall be done by the presiding person after a discussion with the OVHP members.
- 3) No evaluator may evaluate the results of the research organization with which he is in a labour-law relation or where there is another conflict of interests.
- 4) Each evaluator awards the result with an integer number on the scale of 0-3.
- 5) A 0 evaluation equals a proposal for rejection; evaluation of 1-3 reflects the increasing quality.
- 6) A result, which receives a 0 evaluation from both evaluators, shall be put on a list of results suggested for rejection and awarding of negative points (i.e. -40(-20) points in case of a B and C type result and -4 points for J_{rec} result type)

- 7) For results that receive a 0 evaluation from only one evaluator and for those where the evaluation differs by more than one grade the presiding person appoints a third evaluator.
- 8) If two of the three evaluators agree on a 0 evaluation, the result shall be put on a list of results suggested for rejection and awarding of negative points (see point 6).
- 9) In other cases the two higher evaluations shall be used
- 10) The point increment will be measured by its sum so that the total of 6 equals 116 points, 5 equals 86 points, 3 equals 26 points and 2 equals 0 points.
- 11) The process of evaluation of J_{rec} results shall be identical; however they receive only numbers 1 and 0.
- 12) The J_{rec} evaluation sum total of 2 is assigned a point score according to Annex 1, Table 1.2. If the result receives the 0 score from two evaluators, it is removed and proposed for being awarded a negative score (see point 6). If the evaluations of two evaluators differ, a third evaluator is selected and the process is analogic to points 8 and 9.

Evaluation in 2013

In 2013 the evaluation will have a simplified form. The subject of evaluation in 2013 will be J_{rec} , B and C type results. Principles 1, 2 and 3 apply without changes, other are simplified as follows:

- 4) Each evaluator awards the result with an integer number on the scale of 0-1.
- 5) A 0 evaluation equals a proposal for removal from evaluation.
- 6) A result, which receives a 0 evaluation from both evaluators, shall be put on a list of results suggested for removal and awarding of a negative score (see point 8).
- 7) For results that receive a 0 evaluation from only one evaluator the presiding person appoints a third evaluator.
- 8) If two of the three evaluators agree on a 0 evaluation, the result shall be put on a list of results suggested for removal and awarding of a negative score of -40(-20) points in case of a B and C type result and -4 points for J_{rec} result type.
- 9) The scoring of results, which are not proposed for removal, is listed in Table 1.1 in Annex 1.

Criteria of expert evaluation

Valid for J_{rec} , B and C type results.

- 3 – the originality of presented research results is of the world class of the given field or in cases of SHV fields at the national level with very significant and provable contributions to the global (or in the case of SHV national) development of the field with a very high methodological level and is highly elaborate;
- 2 – the presented research results have a significant and provable partial contribution to the field and is highly elaborate;
- 1 – the result fulfils the definition but it does not match any of the two previous groups;
- 0 – the result does not fulfil the definition of J_{rec} , B and C type results.

In all cases (0-3) the evaluators must provide reasoning for their evaluation.

Note: the originality of the results consists of previously unpublished facts or theories, brand new theoretical approaches, comparisons of presented results with important studies etc. In fields, which have periodicals in global databases the significance of the referred specialist book should be evidenced by publications of authors in J_{imp} , J_{SC} a J_{neimp} periodicals.

VII. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF SELECTED RESULTS – PILLAR II.

The aim of the pillar is to evaluate and reward the quality of results created by RO. The dominant part of this pillar lies in expert evaluation of the quality of a limited number of selected results. Part of the reward will be meant for the support of excellence in international context, which will be proved by success in receiving ERC (European Research Council) projects.

VII.1. Bonus reward for ERC projects

If the RVVI does not set another value, then 2000 points shall belong to the institution, whose employee received a grant from the European Research Council (hereinafter only “ERC”) within the evaluated five-year period.

The decisive factor is the employment at the moment the grant is awarded. If the researcher changes his employer, the points will not be transferred with him. A necessary condition for this bonus reward is that the fundamental part of the results listed in the ERC grant application originated at this workplace and the grant award process thus could be viewed as utilization of the given RO’s results by an external subject. If the researcher who is awarded the ERC grant is employed by multiple RO at the time he receives it, he can choose which RO shall receive these points or in what ratio these points shall be divided. The decision is based on which workplaces the results listed in the ERC application were created in.

VII.2. Evaluation of the quality of selected results

The allocation of the number of submitted results, years 2013 and 2014. For each RO, which submits at least one scored result to RIV in 2013, the institutional support shall be registered. The support for RVO or support for research programmes ending in 2013 is taken into account. If the RVVI does not set another value, then for each 10 million CZK or part thereof the RO allocates one result, which it will submit for expert evaluation within Pillar II. in 2014.

In the following years the process is similar, the obligation of the RO to submit selected results in the year N+1 depends on whether it submitted at least one scored result to RIV in the year N. The amount of institutional support in the year N then determines the number of submitted results in the year N+1.

Each RO sends the results, which it decided to submit to expert evaluation, within the period specified in the schedule provided in the Annex. By “sending” it is understood to provide all information, which is necessary to evaluate the result (in the case of a publication it is the physical copy of the book, a copy of an article etc.; in case of a technical instrument its detailed documentation etc.).

Together with the result itself the RO also submits a justification (in English) why the submitted research should be considered particularly interesting and possibly other documentation providing evidence of this result’s quality.

In the year N it is possible to submit results applied within the previous five-year period, i.e. years N-5 – N-1.

The submitted results must be registered in RIV. In the case of a result that has been already registered in RIV in previous years the R&D&I operator adds to the current data the information that the result has been submitted to expert evaluation within Pillar II. (when submitted by a RO the RIV provides a reference and the R&D&I operator updates the information). It is possible to submit results that belong to the scored types according to Pillars I. and III. as well as non-scored results.

For each submitted result the RO lists the field group within which the result shall be evaluated. The RO is free to choose the field within which it will submit its results.

If a result received an A evaluation (see below), it will not be submitted for evaluation in the following years. If it received a B evaluation, the RO may submit it to repeated evaluation in the following years (while fulfilling the condition of a five-year period). When submitting a result repeatedly the RO updates the justification of the special significance of the given result (e.g. an increase in citations etc.).

If a RO does not submit any reasons to expert evaluation or submits a lower number than was originally allocated, the missing results will be automatically counted as if they received the B evaluation (see below). The field group towards which these results are counted is determined by the field in which the given RO gained the most points in the previous evaluation period according to Pillars I. and III. If there are more than 5 such missing results for a given RO and this RO has more than 20% of its RIV points in more than 1 field, the missing results are counted towards these fields proportionally.

VII.3. Results created by several cooperating RO

If any RO submits a result for evaluation within Pillar II., which was achieved in cooperation with other Czech institutions, it will also present an approved list of shares of individual Czech institutions in this result. If it does not present such list, it stands that the share are determined by a rule set for Pillar I. If one of the authors of the result bears a designation “corresponding author” or an equivalent of this designation and the address of the corresponding author provided in the result matches the address of a Czech RO, this RO has the right to independently decide the determination of the shares of the cooperating ROs. This also applies if foreign authors participated in the result (if the corresponding author is Czech, he can e.g. set the share of foreign authors to be lower than what it would be using the rule for counting each non-domestic author with a ½ weight). The sum of such determined shares contributes to the total number of results, which the institution has to submit each year.

Other institutions, which participated in the submitted result, may, but do not have to, register this result within Pillar II. If they do not register it in the same year as the first institution, which submitted it, they can do so later (within the given five-year period). If a result received an A evaluation, any of the participating institutions may claim co-authorship at any time (however only once) in the relevant time period. If the result has previously been evaluated as B, any of the participating institutions may submit it for reevaluation in the following years.

VII.4. Evaluation of the results

Results in each field group will be evaluated by a panel. These results will be then divided into two classes – A and B – with the A class containing the most significant or highest quality results in the given field. The amount of results with the A classification cannot exceed 20% of the total number of results submitted within the given field group. This quota includes also shares in previously evaluated results classified as A, to which a participating institution claims co-authorship in the given year.

When evaluating results the panel takes into account primarily the significance of the achieved results within the field and then the real contribution of Czech facilities to its creation (i.e. not only the share formally calculated from the number of authors). It is based on the study of each submitted result, the presenter's explanation and other information, which the presenter obtains through his own initiative (e.g. expert opinions, own bibliometric analysis etc.). In case of results where the "corresponding author" is explicitly designated, the fact whether the author is from the submitting institution is taken into account.

When dividing results into the two groups the panel also takes into account the classification from the previous years. When classifying the results the Panel tries to reach a consensus. If that is not possible, the final classification is decided by vote. Apart from the classification itself the Panel also publishes the explanation of its decisions – particularly all main arguments for placing the results into the A class. Another output of the panel is its opinion on the quality ratio of the results placed into the A class to the global standard or top global results.

If the final verdict was not reached by consensus the outvoted panel members write their reasoning as well. They will also provide their opinion on how they would classify the results and why. The explanation of the panel's decision, the opinion of the outvoted members as well as the composition of the panel will be published.

VII.5 Establishing the panels

In 2013 (see Annex 10) RO will be addressed a call for proposals of panel members. The call includes an instruction to propose mainly foreign experts with a sufficiently wide knowledge, solid reputation and if possible minimal ties to the domestic institutions.

The RVVI is responsible for the establishment of the panels, which is based on the proposals sent by the individual RO and other addressed subjects. The RVVI may also address candidates in their own initiative. When establishing a panel the RVVI strives for a majority of foreign experts (if possible), so that the necessary coverage is achieved and ties to domestic institutions were kept to a minimum. Each panel has at least 15 members, usually 15-20. The RVVI also appoints the panel chair.

The members of the panel are appointed for a term of two calendar years by the RVVI with the term of office ending on 31st December. The panel members may be appointed for a maximum of three consecutive terms. The first term starts on 1st January 2014. On 1st January of each even year at least one third of the panel members will be changed.

If it proves to be necessary, the RVVI may add panel members during the year (e.g. because it turns out that some field received a significantly higher number of submissions than expected).

VII.6. Calculation of the point score

The w parameter will be the selected maximum relative year-on-year decrease of the point score allotted for each RO to Pillar II. If the RVVI does not decide otherwise, $w = 10\%$.

In 2013 the default score allotted for a given RO to Pillar II is 1/9 of the total number of points this RO received according to Pillars I. and III. This value for the k^{th} RO is designated $R_k^{(2013)}$. Similarly the point score of the k^{th} RO in year N is designated $R_k^{(N)}$.

For each RO the number of selected results in classes A and B will be discovered, for k^{th} RO these values are n_k^A and n_k^B , whereas $n_k^A + n_k^B = n_k$

where n_k is the total number of results allocated to the k^{th} RO. The results, in which the RO participated partially, will be added to these values in the appropriate ratio.

For the k^{th} RO an auxiliary quantity p_k shall be set, where $p_k = n_k^A / n_k$.

The α coefficient shall be set:

$$\alpha = w \sum_k R_k^{(N)} / [\sum_k p_k R_k^{(N)}]$$

The score of the k^{th} RO in the year N+1 is then

$$R_k^{(N+1)} = (1 - w + \alpha p_k) R_k^{(N)}$$

The provided procedure will ensure that:

$$\sum_k R_k^{(N+1)} = \sum_k R_k^{(N)} \quad (\text{the sum of all scores of all RO does not change}),$$

$$(R_k^{(N+1)} - R_k^{(N)}) / R_k^{(N)} \geq -w$$

i.e. the relative year-on-year decrease of the score of any RO does not exceed w . The RO, which does not have any A class result has its year-on-year decrease equal to $-w$, while a RO with all results of the A class has a year-on-year increase larger than w .

VII.7. Dividing the points among faculties

To be able to continue to list scores of individual faculties and other organizational units of the universities (hereinafter only “faculties”), it is necessary to set a rule for dividing points awarded to the university among individual faculties. As the Pillar II. does not contain a direct link between the result and a point value anymore and because the universities are granted the choice which results and in which fields they will submit, it is necessary to reflect this choice in the university’s internal point division. It is assumed that the university’s decision will be respected as to how these points will be divided among faculties. If the university does not intend to implement internal rules, the following procedure shall be used:

- I. The default value for f^{th} faculty in 2013 shall be the $R_{k,f}^{(2013)}$ part of the $R_k^{(2013)}$ value of the given (k^{th}) university determined by the share of this faculty in the university’s score in Pillars I. and III.
- II. In the following years the value for f^{th} faculty in the year N+1 is $R_{k,f}^{(N+1)} = (1 - w)R_{k,f}^{(N)} + \alpha (n_{k,f}^A / n_k) R_k^{(N)}$,
whereas $n_{k,f}^A$ is the number of the f^{th} faculty A class results.

VII.8. The method of point allocation in case of the change of the share allotted to Pillar II.

If the RVVI decides to change the share allotted to Pillar II. the following process is used:

If the share of Pillar II. in year N is equal to P_N and the share in the year N+1 should be equal to P_{N+1} (where $P_{2014} = 10\%$), then first the point values of the k^{th} RO in the year N+1 for individual pillars shall be calculated according to the rules assuming the original allocation to individual pillars.

Then the point value of all results allotted to Pillars I. and III. will be changed to $(1 + P_N - P_{N+1})$ multiple of the original value and the point value allotted for the given RO to Pillar II. will be calculated so that the total sum of all scores in all pillars remained unchanged for this RO. In the following year the new default value for Pillar II. will be used.

VIII. Evaluation of patents and non-publication results of the applied research – Pillar III.

Each year 17.5% of the awarded points from the total allotted do Pillar I. and III. are allocated to patents and non-publication results. The method of awarding these points consists of two steps. First the scores of patents, breeds and varieties, which were reported by individual RO or their organizational unites (hereinafter “RO”) in the given year regardless of the possible tie to any of the projects. Patents, breeds and varieties will be awarded the following scores:

Result type		Points	
P	patent	„European“ patent (EPO) ¹⁰ , USA (USPTO) and Japan patent	100
		Czech or national patent (with the exception of USA and Japan), which is being used based on a valid licence agreement	50
		Other patents ¹¹	10
Z_{plem}	breed	A new breed book was implemented for the result according to § 9, of the Act. No. 154/2000 Coll. on breeding, stirpiculture and record keeping of farm animals and on amendments to some related Acts (Breeding Act)	25
Z_{odru}	variety	The result is granted a protection of rights according to Act No. 408/2000 Coll., on the protection of plant variety rights and the amendment to Act No. 92/1996 Coll., on plant varieties, seed and planting material of cultivated plants, as last amended, (Act on the protection of plant variety rights)	25

The sum of the scores for these patents, varieties and breeds in the given year is $Points_{Pat+Plem}$. The score $Points_{Pj+SmV}$, which in the given year will be awarded for non-publication results of projects of applied and contractual research will be set as

$$Points_{Pj+SmV} = 105\,000 - Points_{Pat+Plem}$$

¹⁰⁾ EPO – European Patent Office is an intergovernmental organization, which was established in 1977 based on the European Patent Convention (EPC). The EPO ensures uniform procedure for submitting applications for patent protection by individual inventors and companies in 39 European countries.

¹¹⁾ A Czech or another national patent awarded, used or not yet used by the patent owner.

If the value of $Points_{Pat+Plem}$ exceeds 15 000, this score will be recalculated so that the value of $Points_{Pat+Plem}$ equals 15 000 points.

In the next step the score will be divided among individual RO so that the proportional part of the score of each RO matched its share in the total amount of appropriate financial resources of RO in the whole Czech Republic, whereas this calculation of the financial resources for the given beneficiary is limited to the recognized expenses of the directed support of applied research programmes (i.e. subsidies + private sources) without investments and possible investments of (other) public resources and further to the paid financial resources of projects of contractual research excluding subcontractors, investments and services.

The institutional support cannot be claimed for results of projects, which are not being supported by state R&D&I budget expenditures with the exception of contractual research; it also cannot be claimed for results supported from structural funds (e.g. OP VK, OP VaVpI, OP PI) and also for results of projects of large R&D&I infrastructures approved by the Czech government. It is possible to claim it for results of the projects of framework EU programmes.

The financial resources related to the creation of applied research results in year N are calculated in a uniform point scale by the following method, where:

$\Sigma_{Projekty}$ **the sum of total recognized expenses** for projects of applied research of all RO in the year N-1. Specifically for the given beneficiary the total recognized expenses of the directed support for applied research projects researched by him without investments and possible investments of (other) public resources (public resources invested in the project can be included only for OSS, but only up to the maximum amount of total recognised expenses of the project) will be counted, for on-going projects and projects finished in the year N-1, which have the indicator “Applied Research”, “Development” or “Innovation” in the CEP database (projects of providers of direct support of R&D&I, 7th FP EU¹²). These data will be part of the CEP.

$\Sigma_{SmlVýzk}$ **the sum of all financial resources** paid for contractual research projects, which were concluded directly between organizations from both the Czech and foreign private or public sector and RO in the year N-1. Specifically for individual contractual research projects the actually paid financial resources will be counted, adjusted for investments, services, additional costs and finances paid to subcontractors. Only those contractual research projects can be applied, for which the paid financial resources in the given year reached at least 50 000 CZK or its equivalent in foreign currency calculated by the exchange rate as of the day the payment was credited to the RO's account. The result of the contractual research should be one of the applied result types.

Furthermore $\Sigma_{ApKč}$ is the sum of all financial resources (for all RO) related to the creation of application results. It stands that $\Sigma_{ApKč} = \Sigma_{Projekty} + \Sigma_{SmlVýzk}$. The weighted sum ($\Sigma_{VsApKč}$) of these financial resources is defined as

$$\Sigma_{VsApKč} = \alpha \Sigma_{Projekty} + \beta \Sigma_{SmlVýzk} .$$

Coefficients α and β are set so that the condition $\Sigma_{VsApKč} = \Sigma_{ApKč}$ is fulfilled and at the same time

¹² In 2013 it is only possible to apply expenses in the amount of the state budget support.

$$\alpha \Sigma_{\text{Projekty}} : \beta \Sigma_{\text{SmlVýzk}} = r_1 : r_2,$$

where r_i are numbers setting the proportional allocation of points to individual research activities. Unless the RVVI stipulates otherwise, $\alpha = \beta = 1$ ¹³. The total sum, which will be awarded to the field group „ObSk“ for application patents is

$$\text{Points}_{\text{Ap_Obsk}} = (\Sigma_{\text{VsApKč_Obsk}} / \Sigma_{\text{ApKč}}) \times \text{Points}_{\text{Pj+SmV}} + \text{Points}_{\text{Pat+Plem_Obsk}} [\text{points}],$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\text{VsApKč_Obsk}} = \alpha \Sigma_{\text{Projekty_Obsk}} + \beta \Sigma_{\text{SmlVýzk_Obsk}}$$

and $\text{Points}_{\text{Pat+Plem_Obsk}}$ is the number of points, which the field group received for patents, breeds and varieties achieved in both the fundamental and applied research. These points are divided among the RO analogically for the purpose of evaluation.

The approval that the given RO solves the application project at the required level, which is the guarantee of achieving the expected results and which is the condition for awarding appropriate points, will be given by the provider of directed support. The provider annually evaluates the state of the research project based on rolling reports, rolling and concluding external examination and also based on whether the appropriate and achieved project results were entered into the RIV database. Each such reported applied research result may only be reported as a result of one project. In the case the project research is of insufficient quality or in case of doubts the provider may withhold its approval to allocate the appropriate number of points until the next year, in exceptional situations until the project is finished, or he may choose not to give approval at all. The approval to allocate the appropriate points for contractual research will be given by the provider of institutional support for the given RO.

¹³ In 2013 the RVVI decided to set the coefficients as follows: $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 0,1$. For the following years the RVVI sets these values by 31. 12. of the previous year at the latest.

IX. Evaluation phases

First phase outputs

- Table 1 – list of all results excluded from the RIV due to their discrepancies in data records, due to which they cannot be included in the further process of evaluation, in the structure of individual tables sorted by providers. These results will be corrected by the submitter and submitted again as a complete result record in the RIV, otherwise these results will not be involved in the evaluation.
- Table 2 – list of results, where conflicts and discrepancies were discovered. In the structure of individual tables sorted by providers are listed all discrepancies between two or more result records, which are ambiguous. All occurrences of the ambiguous result in RIV are listed for the given submitter, i.e. all occurrences from all submitters are listed.
- Table 2a – the list of cases, where one of the authors of a result was listed as domestic author by two or more submitters. This table serves as an information supplement for submitters for possible corrections of incorrect information about domestic authors. The same author at two or more submitters is not a monitored conflict. Incorrectly entered data are being corrected in the usual way, i.e. removal of the incorrect RIV record and submission of a new correct one according to the schedule presented in Annex 10.

Results of the first phase will be made available to:

- providers of support for R&D&I;
- founders of RO included in the Evaluation (or the body that fulfils this function);
- RO included in the Evaluation, exclusively via the appropriate founders of RO (or the body that fulfils this function), or providers of institutional support;
- RVVI expert and advisory bodies.

Second phase outputs

Within the second phase it is possible to solve the discrepancies listed in Tables 1 and 2 via individual providers. At the same time the RO may remove their result records, if they discovered that they contain incorrect data, for which a procedure according to §14 par.5 of the Act may be applied. **In this evaluation phase it is not possible to request to put additional results in for evaluation, although they are submitted to RIV.**

Corrections of incorrect results are done by sending the corrected higher version, in this case it is not necessary to ask for removal of incorrect records.

The evaluation of results by OVHP is done simultaneously within the second phase.

The data about individual RO concerning financial resources in Pillar II. will also be submitted via providers within the second phase.

Third phase outputs

- Table 3 – list of all evaluated results, which were included in the Evaluation within Pillars I. and II., sorted alphabetically by the consolidate field groups, provider and further by RO and its organizational units.

- Table 4 – list of results excluded from Evaluation performed by OVHP and RVVI expert and advisory bodies based on performed checks, sorted alphabetically by the consolidate field groups, provider and further by RO and its organizational units.
- Table 5work – results of RO evaluation according to pillar III., sorted alphabetically by the consolidate field groups, provider and further by RO and its organizational units.

Outputs from the third phase will be made available to:

- providers of support for R&D&I;
- founders of RO included in the Evaluation (or the body that fulfils this function);
- RO included in the Evaluation, exclusively via the appropriate founders of RO (or the body that fulfils this function), or providers of institutional support;
- RVVI expert and advisory bodies.

Comments regarding Table 4 can be sent within the period specified in the schedule provided in the Annex. In case the comment sent to RVVI is recognised as justified, the result will be placed back into the Evaluation. In the opposite case these results will be subjected to procedure according to §14 par.5 of the Act in the amount set by the RVVI.

Comments can be sent only by providers by returning the Table 4, where the provider will write specific justification for returning the result into Evaluation in the given year in a special column, which is reserved for his use. **In the comment it is not possible to request correction of the data submitted to RIV or inclusion of other results.**

Fourth phase outputs

- Table 5 – final result of the evaluation of RO, sorted alphabetically by the consolidate field groups, provider and further by RO and its organizational units.

The fourth phase outputs are part of the final outputs of the whole evaluation and are approved by RVVI at its meeting. Table 5 is one of the documents used for the “Draft state budget expenditures on R&D&I according to § 5a par. 2 of the Act”, which the RVVI sends to the administrators of budgetary chapters each year in January.

Outputs from the fourth phase will be publicly available via the internet application “Evaluation”, which consists of two parts:

“The RO part” – RO included in evaluation according to Pillar I., which includes:

- basic identification of RO;
- for a given RO within Pillar I. – the number of evaluated and not evaluated results, number of excluded results, the sum of scores of these results for normalization (i.e. adjusted points);
- for a given RO within Pillar I. – the number of submitted results, the number of these results in A class and the awarded score;
- the awarded score within Pillar III. for a given RO.

“The RO result part” – results included in evaluation within Pillar I., which includes:

- basic identification of the result;
- the status of the result within Pillar I., if applicable the reason for its exclusion;
- scores of these results within Pillar I. prior to and after normalization (i.e. adjusted and non-adjusted points), including the appropriate correction coefficient;

- classification of the result in A or B class according to Pillar II. and the awarded score;

The internet application will enable similar search as it is with the R&D&I IS – RIV and also the export of data for individual RO.

X. EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF FINISHED PROGRAMMES OF RESEARCH, EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION

Evaluation of results of finished programmes is provided by RVVI according to the Methodology approved by the Czech government in accordance with § 35 par. 2 d) of the Act.

Research, development and innovation programme is a set of factual, time and financial conditions for activities necessary to achieve the approved goals of a programme declared by the provider in a public tender in R&D&I or in the documentation of a public procurement in R&D&I for individual projects within the programme.

The aim of the summary evaluation of finished programmes is to assess whether their expected goals have been achieved and further evaluate the use of directed support provided according to §3 par. 2 of the Act.

X.1. Initial data for summary evaluation of finished programmes

The summary evaluation of finished programmes performed in the given year will include **programmes that finished in the previous year**. Their list is provided in Annex 4.

The summary evaluation will primarily use data, which the individual providers submitted to R&D&I IS (i.e. approved programme goals and data about public tenders and all finished projects, for which directed support had been provided within the programme, the amount of provided support and related project results submitted by the provider etc.).

At the same time the information will be used which the RVVI receives from individual providers within the summary reports on their evaluation of finished programmes. These reports shall be submitted by 30th October in the following structure:

- **basic information about the approved programme** – the programme code and name, possible classification into subprogrammes, research period, providers, information about the approval by the Czech government or the territorial self-administration unit's council, whether the programme was notified by the EC, planned total costs and state budget expenditures for the whole duration of the programme, list of changes made during the research and the method of their approval;
- **basic information about the program execution in case of its execution in the form of public procurement in R&D&I**, i.e. the number of published tender documentations, number of proposals submitted within the public procurement proceedings,
- **list of particularly significant results** with justification of the significance of the specific result (a particularly significant result must be specific and accurately identifiable in RIV, e.g. it is not possible to state that the result is a number of valuable studies or analyses, number of results is of top quality within its field etc. On the contrary it is desirable to provide specific results, their numbers in e.g. decisions to award international patents, implementations of results into manufacturing processes including the data on their economic benefit),
- **In what way the achieved results will be utilized** – specific use, not general statements such as that the results will be used in the conceptual work of the ministry etc. On the contrary it is

desirable to provide specific information about the economic benefits such as sold license rights to patents etc.,

- **comparison of achieved results with the approved programme goals**, i.e. whether and how the results achieved by solving individual projects contributed to the achievement of the goal, whereas the rate of accomplishment of the programme goals is expressed as a percentage by mutual comparison of the approved type composition and quantification of results with the achieved type composition and quantification of the finished programme,
- **comparison of achieved programme results with the status abroad** at the time the programme finished.

If the report submitted by the provider about his evaluation of the finished programme will not contain all required necessities, the provider will be asked to correct this. If the correction will not be made, this fact will be included in the summary evaluation of the finished programmes presented to the Czech government.

If serious conflicts are discovered between the data included in R&D&I IS and the verbal evaluation of providers, the providers may be ordered to correct this by a government resolution on the summary evaluation of finished programmes.

X.2 The procedure of summary evaluation of finished programmes

The R&D&I IS operator selects the evaluated records from RIV, submitted and filed in R&D&I IS by **7th September**. The operator then processes these data in several subsequent steps:

- 1) Unification of occurrences of identical results – in case of a repeated occurrence of the same result, i.e. in case of the repeated submission of identical data while keeping ties to the specific research activities. During the occurrence unification process each group of identical results is assigned an identification code. Results, where the application year would precede the year the appropriate research activity started, will not be included in the programme evaluation.
- 2) Assignment of a binary value denoting whether the project did or did not report a result.

The data will be processed into Table P1, which for each programme will contain data about individual projects including information about expenditures and achieved results. The structure of Table P1 is provided in Annex 5.

Specific programme results are such results, which are not including among the RO Evaluation results listed in Annex 1, i.e. belong to the group of results without a score.

X.3. Outputs of the summary evaluation of finished programmes

The output of this evaluation is Table P2, which contains data about the evaluated projects aggregated according to individual evaluated programmes. The structure of Table P is provided in Annex 5.

The results of the summary evaluation will be submitted to the RVVI for approval. The RVVI then submits the evaluation to the Czech government by the end of March of the following year. After the approval by the Czech government the results will be published on the RVVI website www.vyzkum.cz.

The summary evaluation will include an overview of evaluated programmes, evaluation results and the summary. In justified cases it will also include measures issued to the provider.

XI. EVALUATION OUPTUTS

The final results of the RO evaluation are the partial outputs from Pillars I., II. and III. These outputs will be available in an electronic form at www.vyzkum.cz, at times specified by the schedule provided in Annex 10 to R&D&I support providers, RO founders included in the Evaluation (or bodies fulfilling this function), RO included in the Evaluation and RVVI expert and advisory bodies.

The final results of the Evaluation of Finished R&D&I Programmes are Tables P1, P2 and a summary verbal evaluation. These documents will be available in an electronic form at www.vyzkum.cz at times specified by the schedule provided in Annex 10.

XII. RULES OF VERIFIABILITY OF REPORTED RESULTS

The rules listed in Annex 9 stipulate and describe criteria and methods of verifiability of information concerning individual result types based on the information about the result provided in RIV. Most of these checks are performed by the R&D&I IS operator, in some of the cases an evaluation will be made by expert and advisory bodies of the RVVI or OVHP. The goal of these checks is to assess the submitted data on the results according to RIV according to these criteria:

- 1) fulfilment of the definition of the appropriate result type;
- 2) assessment of correct placement in a specific result type and field group;
- 3) verification of truth, i.e. whether the result actually exists.

If there are doubts about the fulfilment of a stipulated criterion a physical check may be performed in cooperation with the provider whether the result meets this criterion. Physical verification may be also performed based on random selection of results or after notification about specific discrepancies in the R&D&I IS records.

Software verification tools will be used for these checks (e.g. existence of ISSN of ISBN, occurrence of the specialist periodical in the evaluated databases etc.). For other forms of verifications there is a set procedure. Final judgment on the exclusion of the result from evaluation, including the decision to award negative points, is in the competence of RVVI.

XIII. CONCLUSION

Processes of RO evaluation and the evaluation of finished R&D&I programmes, as provided in this Methodology, are binding for the providers, RVVI and the R&D&I IS operator.

The results of the evaluation according to the Methodology will be at the specific dates and in the specific forms discussed at RVVI meetings, published at www.vyzkum.cz and in case of evaluation of finished R&D&I programmes submitted to the government for approval.

This Methodology comes into force on the day of its approval by the Czech government.

XIV. ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Scoring of publication results

Annex 2 – Definitions of result types valid from the year 2013 including

Annex 3 – Outputs from the evaluation of results of research organizations

Annex 4 – List of finished R&D&I programmes

Annex 5 – Outputs from the evaluation of results of finished R&D&I programmes

Annex 6 – Code list of the field groups

Annex 7 – Classification of fields into field groups

Annex 8 – Score limits of individual result types

Annex 9 – Criteria of verifiability of scored results

Annex 10 – Schedule

Annex 1

SCORING OF PUBLICATION RESULTS

TABLE 1.1: SCORING OF PUBLICATION RESULTS IN 2013

Result type		SHVa, SHVb¹⁾		Other fields within which the given result type is evaluated
Jimp	Article in an impacted periodical ²⁾		10 - 305 ³⁾	
Jsc	Article in the Scopus database ⁴⁾		10 - 305 ⁴⁾	
Jneimp	Article in the ERIH database	INT 1	30	12
		INT 2	20	11
		NAT	10	10
Jrec	Article in a periodical included in the list of reviewed periodicals ⁵⁾		4 ⁷⁾	0
B	Specialist book	Global language	40	40
		Other languages		20
D	Article in proceedings ⁶⁾		8 - 60 ⁶⁾	

TABLE 1.2: SCORING OF PUBLICATION RESULTS IN 2014 AND THE FOLLOWING YEARS

Result type		SHVa, SHVb¹⁾		Other fields
Jimp	Article in an impacted periodical ²⁾		10 - 305 ³⁾	
Jsc	Article in the Scopus database ⁴⁾		10 - 305 ⁴⁾	
Jneimp	Article in the ERIH database	INT 1	30	12
		INT 2	20	11
		NAT	10	10
Jrec	Article in a periodical included in the list of reviewed periodicals ⁵⁾		4 ⁷⁾	0
B	Specialist book		4 - 120 ⁸⁾	
D	Article in proceedings ⁶⁾		8 - 60 ⁶⁾	

SHVa, SHVb include field groups 1 and 2 defined in a table in Annex 7

- 2) Publications registered in the following databases of Web of Science (WoS) by Thomson Reuters: Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-EXPANDED) – 1945 – present; Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) – 1980 – present; Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) – 1980 – present; Index Chemicus (IC) – 1993 – present; Current Chemical Reactions (CCR-EXPANDED) – 1986 – present. If the periodical still does not have its impact factor calculated, the article is awarded the lowest J_{imp} score.
- 3) Evaluation $J_{imp} = 10 + 295 \times \text{Factor}$, where:
- Factor** = $(1 - N) / (1 + (N / 0,057))$, where N is the normalized ranking of the periodical,
 $N = (P - 1) / (P_{max} - 1)$
- P = the periodical's ranking according to the Journal Citation Report in a series sorted in the descending order by IF
- The calculation uses the IF value valid in the result application year adjusted for a disproportional share of the periodical's own citations, IFO. The adjustment is performed as follows:
- if the share of own citation according to the Journal Citation Report is less or equal to 0,4, then $IFO = IF$
 - if the share of own citation according to the Journal Citation Report exceeds 0,4, then $IFO = IF * 0,4 / PSC$, where PSC is the share of own citations according to the Journal Citation Report
- P_{max} = total number of periodicals in the given field according to the Journal Citation Report
- If the periodical is registered for several fields, the normalized ranking of the periodical N will be calculated as the arithmetic average of the normalized rankings of the periodical in all fields where it is registered.
- 4) Publications in the SCOPUS database will be scored similarly to J_{imp} according to the SJR citation index. The SJR index value will not be adjusted as the adjustment for own citation is already performed by the database operator.
- 5) The list of non-impacted periodicals published in the Czech Republic including the information about its establishment and validity is published at www.vyzkum.cz. In List update started in April 2013.
- 6) The proceedings must be registered in the SCOPUS database as Book Series or Conference Proceedings or in the Conference Proceedings Citation Index databases of Thomson Reuters with the indicator Proceedings Paper, Conference Paper or Conference Review with a listed ISBN, or possibly ISBN and ISSN. If the SCOPUS database assigns it a non-zero value of the SJR index, the score is calculated as $D = 8 + 52 * (1-N)$, where N is the normalized ranking (see note 3). In other cases $D = 8$. The score of 8 also applies to articles in periodicals registered in the SCOPUS database or Thomson Reuters databases, if the articles have an indicator Proceedings Paper, Conference Paper or Conference Review.
- 7) All J_{rec} type results, which will be the subject of evaluation, will be verified by OVHP.
- 8) The value will be set during expert evaluation.

Annex 2

DEFINITION OF RESULT TYPES

The below listed definitions are valid from 2013 (inclusive).

Individual results are listed as they are set for the R&D&I IS¹⁴ – RIV database.

All result types, which were achieved by research activities and with the support provided according to the law may be assigned to the given research activity only if they were demonstrably and indisputably achieved by this research activity. The research activity also cannot be assigned a result, whose author did not participate in the activity.

Furthermore, one result of the research activity can be submitted to the RIV by each submitter only once and shall be designated as the result type, which characterizes the achieved result the most.

Note: the review (reviewing) is an evaluation process, which the scientific work (or generally a scientific or artistic work) goes through prior to its publishing, whereas the final version includes the incorporated comments of the reviewers. The requirement for reviewing is related to J, B, C and D result types. Reviewed publication (book, proceedings, article, periodical) means that an evaluation was created for the submitted article (book, chapter) after it was received by the publisher, based on which the author possibly makes adjustments to his work, which is then published.

Result code	Result name	Description
I. category – Publication results		
J	Reviewed specialist article	<p>Definition:</p> <p>A reviewed article is an original or summarizing article published in a specialist periodical regardless of the publisher's nationality, which was created by an author or team of which the author was a member. It is a complete text structures according to the publisher's requirements for science work structure (usually a summary, introduction, literary overview, material and methods, results, discussion, conclusion) with the usual way of using citations and possibly notes. These types of articles are usually included in the group of original or summarizing articles in the periodical's table of contents.</p> <p>A specialist periodical is a reviewed scientific journal with a scientific editorial board, which is published or was published periodically in a print, print and electronic or just electronic form.</p> <p>Reviewed articles in a specialist periodical are classified as:</p> <p>J_{imp} – original/summarizing article in a specialist periodical, which is included in the Web of Science database of the Thomson Reuters Company with the indicator „Article“, „Review“, or „Letter“, in 2013 also „Proceedings Paper“;</p> <p>J_{sc} – original/summarizing article in a specialist periodical, which is included in the SCOPUS database of the Elsevier company with the</p>

¹⁴ § 30 of the Act and Government Resolution No. 397/2009 Coll., on the R&D&I IS

		<p>indicator příznakem „Article“, „Review“, or „Letter, in 2013 also „Conference Paper“;</p> <p>J_{neimp} – original/summarizing article in a specialist periodical, which is included in the ERIH database;</p> <p>J_{rec} – original/summarizing article in a specialist periodical, which is included in the current List of Non-impacted Reviewed Periodicals Published in the Czech Republic (published at www.vyzkum.cz).</p> <p>Specialist periodicals are not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - periodicals without ISSN, or even e-ISSN; - periodicals or special periodicals published simultaneously with ISSN and ISBN in the print form, (this is often the case of conference papers, which are registered in the WoS and SCOPUS databases. Results published in this type of source belong to the D type); - periodicals which are not reviewed or for which the review process is not published (e.g. some of the periodicals published in the Open Access form); - periodicals with the characteristic of the daily or newspaper press, i.e. common press media, topical “popular science” supplements, weeklies, specialist newspaper (e.g. Economic News, Teacher News, Healthcare News etc.); - popular science periodicals aimed at general public, published by commercial publishers, public and other institutions; - popularizing specialist periodicals aimed at a broader public, e.g. published by specialist organizations, scientific institutions etc. in order to promote science; - periodicals of trade unions, political parties, associations etc.; - movie and radio periodicals; - company and insurance periodicals; - forms and bulletins; - special issues of journals where conference papers are published, are not considered periodicals. <p>A reviewed specialist article is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a reprint, abstract, extended abstracts (e.g. at a conference) etc., although published in a specialist periodical, articles of an informative or popularizing nature regarding research results; - editorial material, corrections, reviews, researches or summaries; - article of the “preprint” type, i.e. a version of the article published prior to the review process; - for J_{rec} articles with a size of under 2 pages of text, where photographs, charts, map annexes, pictures, tables and advertisements are not counted towards the size.
B	Specialist book	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>A specialist book presents the original results of a research that has been conducted by the author of the book or a team of which the author was a member. A book is a non-periodical specialist publication of at least 50 printed pages of text without photographs, pictures, maps and similar annexes, published in a printed or electronic form and reviewed by at least one generally regarded expert from the appropriate field (however not from the author’s workplace) in the form of a reader’s review. This regards a precisely defined issue of a certain field, contains the formulation of an identifiable and scientifically recognised methodology (explicitly</p>

		<p>formulated methodological foundations also in monographies leading to applications and/or formulations of a new methodology based on the current theoretical research in the given field). The formal attributes of a specialist book are references to literature in text, bibliography, summary in at least one world language, possibly notes and source bibliography.</p> <p>The book is assigned an ISBN or ISMN code. The whole book is created by a uniform team of authors (regardless of the share of individual team members in the contents) even if individual chapters have separate authorship. A scientific book is for example a monograph, scientifically composed encyclopaedia or lexicon, critical edition of source, critical edition of artistic (musical, applied arts etc.) materials supplemented by a study, critical commented translation of complex philosophical, historical or philological texts supplemented by a study, scientifically compiled language dictionary or a specialist explanatory dictionary, critical catalogue of an exhibition etc., if they meet the listed formal criteria.</p> <p>In case of a multi-volume scientific monograph it is possible to file each volume into RIV, if each of the volumes separately meets the listed criteria and has been published as a separate publication with its own ISBN. If a specialist book is filed in RIV as a B-type result, its chapter cannot be filed as C-type results for the same submitter.</p> <p><u>A specialist book is not:</u></p> <p>books without ISBN or even ISMN; textbooks; expert opinions and assessments, studies, translations, handbooks, informational and promotional publications, almanacs (with the exception of those, which meet the criteria for a specialist book), annual or other periodic reports; published diploma, doctoral, habilitation and dissertation theses based on primary works of the J_{imp} type, which have a commentary and an ISBN code; common dictionaries; printed or electronically published set of research papers, purposefully published sets of specialist papers (e.g. within one workplace); printed or electronically published set of abstracts or extended abstracts or oral statements from conferences; methodological handbooks, catalogues and norms; proceedings (individual contributions in proceedings are D-type results); fiction, popular science literature, travelogues, theatre play scripts; selection bibliographies, annual reports, speeches, news reports, sets of student competition papers, touristic guides; commercial translations from foreign languages; memoirs, information materials, popularizing monographs, biographies, autobiographies, purposefully monographically published concluding reports from grants or projects.</p> <p>There is still the obligation that if a book is published in the Czech Republic the obligatory issue must be registered in the Czech National Library.</p>
C	Chapter in a specialist book	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>A chapter or chapters in a specialist book (if the book fulfils the criteria for a B-type result) apply in the case that the book has only one editor or if the</p>

		author is listed in the whole book (front page, reverse front page) as a co-author (albeit with a minor share in the content) and is a member of the team of authors with clearly designated main authors. The chapter however must have a single author or a team of authors listed.
D	Article in proceedings	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The article in proceedings presents original results of research that has been conducted by an author or a team, of which the author was a member. The article has the usual structure of a scientific work with the usual citation method (not an abstract or an extended abstract) and is published in proceedings.</p> <p>Proceedings are a non-periodic publication published in the context of a conference, seminar or symposium, which contains independent theses by various authors, which usually have a common element or related topics and is assigned an ISSN as well as an ISBN code, or just an ISBN code.</p> <p>Proceedings are a non-periodic publication published in the context of a conference, seminar or symposium, which contains independent theses by various authors, which usually have a common element or related topics and is assigned an ISSN as well as an ISBN code, or just an ISBN code.</p> <p>For the article to be evaluated as an article in proceedings, it has to be registered in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the SCOPUS databases as a Book Series or Conference Proceedings source and has an ISBN code or an ISSN as well as an ISBN code, the Conference Proceedings Citation Index database of the Thomson Reuters Company and has an ISBN code or an ISSN as well as an ISBN code, article in a special issue of a periodical registered in one of the above listed databases, which is dedicated to publishing conference papers, <p>and has at least 2 pages of text.</p> <p><u>Article in proceedings is not:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - occasionally published sets of specialist papers (e.g. within one workplace, anniversary, annual conferences); - collected and published abstracts or extended abstracts; - sorted articles published elsewhere.
II. category - Patents		
P	Patent	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>„ A patent is an invention, which receives an invention certificate, which is awarded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for Czech patents by the Industrial Property Office according to the Act No. 527/1990 Coll., the Protection of Industrial Designs, as amended; - for European patents by the European Patent Office (EPO) according to the rules stipulated by the European Patent Convention; - for other patents by the appropriate patent office according to the rules

		<p>stipulated by the given patent office.</p> <p>The result is an awarded patent, which protects the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. A result may be considered an applied result of this type only at the moment the patent certificate is issued (in case of a Czech patent) or another certificate with the same effect.</p> <p><u>a patent is not:</u></p> <p>a patent application in any phase of the patent proceedings; patent validation (translation) in other countries; a protection of rights for a variety or software issued by an appropriate national patent office (e.g. variety protection issued by the US Patent Office, Russian software protection etc.).</p>
III. category – Applied results		
Z_{polop}	Trial operation	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The trial operation result verified the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. This means the verification of the functionality of laboratory procedures in greater scales, i.e. in trial or verification operations, which serve to verify the properties, activities, failure rate and other monitored parameters for putting the new system into operation to achieve maximum or planned output. Trial operation must be supplemented at least with a plan or a design of equipment, which will enable the planned production in a larger scale (serial or mass production). A necessary condition is the novelty and uniqueness of the design – the whole production process (technology) including machinery, supplemented by a complete technical documentation of the result.</p> <p><u>A trial operation is not:</u></p> <p>a current or already functional operation, for which there is going to be a change, extension or improvement (innovation) of partial technological or system elements, including controlling elements.</p>
Z_{tech}	Verified technology	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The trial operation result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is similar to trial operation with the difference being that novelty is applied to the production process (technology). The necessary condition is testing (verification) of the technology supplemented by a verification protocol and subsequent utilization in production, which is evidenced by concluding a contract. A result can be labelled as verified technology if e.g. it is the subject of a contract on result application concluded between the author of the result (beneficiary or another party) and the user of the result. Another condition is the technical documentation of the result.</p>
Z_{odru}	Variety	<p>The variety result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result where a new plant variety was created, which receives</p>

		<p>a trademark according to Act No. 408/2000 Coll. on the Protection of Plant Variety Rights and the Amendment to Act No. 92/ 1996 Coll., on Plant Varieties, Seed and Planting Material of Cultivated Plants as amended (the Act on the Protection of Plant Variety Rights), as amended.</p> <p><u>A variety is not:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - granted registrations to put varieties into circulation; - applications during any phase of the proceedings on awarding rights protection.
Z_{plem}	Breed	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The breed result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. The result is a new breed, for which a new pedigree book is established according to § 9 of the Act No. 154/2000 Coll., on Breeding, Stirpiculture and Record-keeping of Farm Animals and on amendments to certain related laws (Breeding Act), as amended.</p>
<p>Note to Z-type results:</p> <p>A condition for registering such result in the R&D&I IS is the conclusion of a contract or application of the result between the author of the result (beneficiary or another party) and the user of the Z-type results Trial Operation and Verified Technology. The application of the variety and breed results is fulfilled by the registration of the given result (variety, breed) in the appropriate register or pedigree book. The price or economic parameters shall be listed, for which the result will be realized (i.e. the price which will be listed as the selling price in the contract on utilization or application of the result).</p>		
F_{uzit}	Utility model	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The utility model result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. Utility models are solutions, which are new, exceed the framework of mere expertise and are industrially usable.</p> <p>Such technical solutions can be considered utility models, which are registered by the Industrial Property Office in the utility model registry. Details regarding the application, registration and validity period of the utility model are stipulated by the Act No. 478/1992 Coll., on Utility Models, as amended. As the Industrial Property Office does not examine whether the utility model was eligible for protection due to its novelty, uniqueness of solution and creative level, there is a condition that the utility model has to be industrially usable based on the technical solution, i.e. whether it can be repeatedly used in an economic activity (see § 5 of the Act No. 478/1992 Coll.).</p>
F_{prum}	Industrial model	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The industrial model result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. Industrial model is the appearance of the product, which lies mainly in the characteristic of lines, shape, colours, outlines, structure or materials of the product itself or its decoration. These are design solutions, i.e. visually sensible property of the product and not e.g. its</p>

		<p>technological or structural nature. The product is an industrially produced or hand-crafted spatial or areal item, i.e. an industrially produced or hand-crafted item including parts meant for its assembly into one completed product, package, arrangement, graphic symbol and a typographic symbol.</p> <p>It is a result that enjoys the protection under Act No. 207/2000 Coll., on the Protection of Industrial Designs and the Amendment to Act No. 527/1990 Coll., on Inventions, Industrial Designs and Rationalisation Proposals as amended.</p> <p><u>An industrial model is not:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a computer programme; - graphical designs without relation to a specific product.
<p>Note to F-type results:</p> <p>It is compulsory to submit information about the registration of models (designation of the appropriate body, date when the certificate was awarded, certificate number) into the RIV.</p>		
G_{prot}	Prototype	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The prototype result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a functional industrial product, manufactured as one piece to test its properties in practice or in a test facility prior to starting the serial or mass production. A product can be considered a prototype only if its development was the aim of a project of applied research, experimental development and innovation or other activities of applied R&D&I. The condition is the novelty and uniqueness of the prototype, which is provable by the technical documentation of the result.</p>
G_{funk}	Functional sample	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The functional sample result realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is similar to prototype with the only exception that the [production of the functional sample is not immediately followed by serial or mass production. It is e.g. design, development and subsequent manufacture of one unique instrument or laboratory equipment or creation of a sample of a biological nature, which has a provably new and unique as well as economically significant property. A product, instrument or a sample of a biological nature can be considered a functional sample only if its development was the aim of a project of applied research, experimental development and innovation or other activities of applied R&D&I. The condition is the novelty and uniqueness of the design of the functional sample, which is provable by the technical documentation of the result.</p>
H_{leg}	Results reflected in legislation and norms	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Results reflected in legislation and norms realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result the contents of which will be (without changes to the core of the proposal, which do not include e.g.</p>

		<p>technical legislative adjustments) incorporated into a regulation (or its part) or a norm. In case of application of the result to legal regulations it must be a Czech regulation. In case of its application to a norm the condition is that the issuer of the norm is an authorized normalization institute competent to issue norms (binding or recommendatory). There is no difference if it is a national (Czech or of another country with national competence) or supranational (European).</p> <p><u>Results reflected in legislation and norms are not:</u></p> <p>translations or edited translations of norms</p>
H_{neleg}	Results reflected in directives and regulations of a non-legislative nature, binding within the competence of the given provider	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Results reflected in directives and regulations of a non-legislative nature, binding within the competence of the given provider realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result which will be used (incorporated without changes to its core, which do not include e.g. technical legislative adjustments) into a directive or a regulation of a non-legislative nature, which the appropriate provider or other competent body can declare as generally binding (it is not a methodology) and is published in the journal of the appropriate ministry or in its electronic form.</p>
H_{konc}	Results reflected in the approved strategic and conceptual documents of R&D&I bodies of the state or public administration	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Results reflected in the approved strategic and conceptual documents of R&D&I bodies of the state or public administration realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result which is demonstrably used in the preparation of specialized R&D&I policies regardless of whether it is on the national, regional or supranational.</p> <p>These results were created exclusively by solving a public tender according to §2 par. 2 g) and k) of the point 2 of the Act.</p>
<p>Note to H-type results:</p> <p>It is compulsory to submit the number, full name of the regulation, norm, directive or a non-legislative regulation (or the number of a government resolution) into the RIV</p>		
N_{met}	Certified methodology	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result certified methodology realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result where the author creates a methodology (the novelty of procedures is a necessary condition), which was approved and recommended for practical use by an appropriate state administration body or an expert certification body.</p>
N_{tec}	Treatment procedure	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result treatment procedure realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the</p>

		author was a member. It is a result, which consists of a set of activities verified in human or veterinary medicine, which includes the description of the illness, determining its causes and based on these findings the development of a treatment method, which leads to restoring the physiological equilibrium of the organism. The condition for treatment procedure is verification via clinical testing.
N_{pam}	Heritage procedure	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result heritage procedure realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. The result is a procedure, which consists of a set of activities, and in some cases even materials and technologies, verified in the applied research of national and cultural identity, which leads to the preservation and improvement of objects of cultural heritage. The condition for heritage procedure is a proven practical testing.</p>
N_{map}	Specialized map with scientific content	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>It is a result where a specialized map with scientific content is a synthesis of point, areal, spatial or even temporal information (4D) is expressed cartographically or via the geographic information system (GIS), as well as their context, gained from a research of a certain area. These are e.g. geoscience maps, maps of cultural heritage objects, archaeological sites, nature reservations, technical objects, large scale maps/plans of smaller areas (e.g. cultural heritage objects and premises of technical objects, archaeological sites and parks) including the comprehensive documentation of construction-historical, urbanistic or landscape surveys as well as e.g. biological and natural phenomena, historical or social contexts etc. A necessary condition is that these are maps, which are documented by data gathered and interpreted by appropriate research methods.</p> <p>In case of a summary publication of individual specialized maps with scientific content in one comprehensive volume it is not possible to apply individual maps as separate results.</p> <p><u>Specialized maps are not:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - state map works; - conventional topographical, cadastral and generally geographic, road, touristic and other maps.

Note to N-type result certified methodology:

The condition is the award of an internationally recognize accreditation by an appropriate expert accreditation body or a certificate of an appropriate expert body of the state administration, which is responsible for the field where the methodology is applied. If the accreditation is awarded by the competent expert body of the state administration, i.e. also a provider, then such accreditation must be awarded based on two independent external examinations. The certification procedure will be regulated by an independent regulation.

Note to N-type result treatment procedure:

The decisive factor for the treatment procedure result will be the publication in the Ministry of Health Journal (in case of humane treatment procedures) or approval by an appropriate competent authority, e.g. State Veterinary Administration (in case of veterinary treatment procedures).

Note to N-type result heritage procedure:

The decisive factor for the heritage procedure result is whether the procedure was provably recommended for use by the National Heritage Institute based on two independent external examinations with the exception of cases where the National Heritage Institute is the author of the heritage procedure.

R	Software	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result software realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result where a software was provably created within a research activity and its author is a person or persons participating in the research activity at the beneficiary (or another participant) and which can be used in accordance with license conditions of the owner according to § 16 of the Act.</p> <p><u>Software is not:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - software, which the beneficiary created solely for his own needs and which is used only by the beneficiary or another participant; - software, which is meant exclusively for the needs of the provider (i.e. if its development is not based on the requirement of legal regulations).
V	Research report	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result research report realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. It is a result, which was applied in accordance with § 4 g) of the Government Resolution No. 267/2002 Coll. until 31st December 2009 and from 1st January 2010 a result, which was applied in accordance with § 4 g) of the Government Resolution No. 397/2009 Coll., containing classified information according to a special regulation (e.g. Act No. 148/1998 Coll. on Protection of Classified Information and Amending Certain Acts, Act No. 412/2005 Coll., On Protection of Classified Information and Security Capacity as amended).</p>
V_{souhrn}	Summary research report	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result summary research report V_{souhrn} may be one of the requested results of applied research projects with directed or contractual funding. A</p>

		summary research report sums up the results and project solving and provides opinion on the fulfilment of set goals of the project. The summary report may be classified, i.e. may not be publicly available.
A	Audiovisual production	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>The result audiovisual production report realized the original results of research and development, which were created by an author or a team of which the author was a member. These are electronic documents (i.e. documents published only in a form that is readable with the use of an appropriate technical equipment, e.g. documents published only on CD/DVD, documents only available on the Internet or a web presentation) with the exception of results that are published in an electronic form, which fulfil the criteria for placement into J, B or D category.</p> <p>Audiovisual production is not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - research reports published in an electronic form; - annual, periodical or concluding (or differently named) reports on the solution of a grant/project or research intent, which are presented to the provider and which are published in an electronic form
E	Exhibition organization	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Organization of an exhibition.</p>
M	Conference organization	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Organization of a conference, seminar or symposium.</p>
W	Workshop organization	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Organization of a workshop.</p>
O	Other results	<p><u>Definition:</u></p> <p>Other results are those results, which do not meet the criteria for the above listed precisely defined result types.</p>

Annex 3

OUTPUTS FROM EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

List of information, which will be listed in individual evaluation output tables. The tables may contain additional auxiliary data.

Table 1: List of all excluded results

The list of records containing data discrepancies due to which it was impossible to continue with the Evaluation.

Contains the following data:

- Information on the submitter (ID and name of the RO, code and name of the organizational unit, name and surname of the natural person);
- Basic information about the result (ID code of the result with the indication of the data transfer to RIV, ID code of the unified result, classified information code, result field, result type, result language, name of the result in the original language, result description);
- More detailed information specifying each result type based on its type (ISSN code, name of the periodical, name of the publisher, ISBN code, research report ordering party, type of access to the result, starting date of the action, web link);
- Code of the data supplier, result application year;
- Reason for exclusion.

Table 2: List of results with conflicts and discrepancies

The list of records with mutual data discrepancies.

Contains the following data:

- Information on the submitter (ID and name of the RO, code and name of the organizational unit, name and surname of the natural person);
- Basic information about the result (ID code of the result with the indication of the data transfer to RIV, ID code of the unified result, classified information code, result field, result type, result language, name of the result in the original language, result description);
- More detailed information specifying each result type based on its type (ISSN code, name of the periodical, name of the publisher, ISBN code, research report ordering party, type of access to the result, starting date of the action, web link);
- Code of the data supplier, result application year
- Characteristics of the data discrepancies or conflicts.

Table 2a: List of cases of several submitters of a uniform result listing the same domestic author

Contains the same data as Table 2.

Table 2a is only meant for informative purposes.

Working Tables J - V: List of all results included in the Evaluation

Used for verification and evaluation of result records according to the rules stipulated within the Pillar I. and II. and Subpillar I. The results are sorted by the main field and then by result type (consolidated data).

Each separate table (for the given type) will contain all relevant information related to the given result type so that the OVHP and possibly the RVVI expert and advisory bodies could make a qualified decision.

Table 3: List of all evaluated results

Contains the following data:

- Information on the submitter (ID and name of the RO, code and name of the organizational unit, name and surname of the natural person);
- Basic information about the result (ID code of the result with the indication of the data transfer to RIV, ID code of the consolidated result, classified information code, result field, result type, result language, name of the result in the original language, result description);
- More detailed information specifying each result type based on its type (ISSN code, name of the periodical, name of the publisher, ISBN code, research report ordering party, type of access to the result, starting date of the action, web link);
- Number of adjusted and non-adjusted points awarded to the consolidated result according to Pillar I.;
- Placement into categories (A, B) according to Pillar II. and the number of awarded points;
- Application year (consolidated record);
- The submitter's share in the consolidated result. Number of adjusted and non-adjusted points of the consolidated result allotted to the submitter awarded to the consolidated result according to Pillar I.

Table 4: List of all excluded results

Separate tables by individual providers.

Contains the following data:

- Information on the submitter (ID and name of the RO, code and name of the organizational unit, name and surname of the natural person);
- Basic information about the result (ID code of the result with the indication of the data transfer to RIV, ID code of the consolidated result, classified information code, result field, result type, result language, name of the result in the original language, result description);
- More detailed information specifying each result type based on its type (ISSN code, name of the periodical, name of the publisher, ISBN code, research report ordering party, type of access to the result, starting date of the action, web link);
- Reason for exclusion.

Table 5prac: Results of RO evaluation according to Pillar III.

The results are sorted alphabetically by field group, provider, RO and their organizational units.

Contains the following data:

- RO name and ID;
- Name and code of the organizational unit;
- Number of projects of applied R&D&I evaluated within Pillar III., field group and their total recognized expenses (without investments);
- Sum of all financial resources paid for projects of contractual research;
- Score according to Pillar III.;

Table 5: Final results of RO evaluation

The results are sorted alphabetically by provider, RO and their organizational units.

Contains the following data:

- RO name and ID;
- Name and code of the organizational unit;
- Number of results submitted within Pillar I. and their total adjusted score;
- Number of results submitted within Pillar I. and their total adjusted score according to individual result types;
- Number of results submitted within Pillar II., and the number of them in the A category;
- Score according to Pillar II. in this and the previous year;
- Score according to Pillar III.;
- Number of non-evaluated results.

Annex 4

LIST OF PROGRAMMES FINISHED IN 2012 (included in evaluation in 2013)

Provider	Programme		Programme duration	
	Code	Name	from	until
Czech Academy of Sciences	KA	Nanotechnology for society	2006	2012
Ministry of Defence	OD	Support of achieved operational skills of Czech Republic armed forces	2008	2012
	OV	Development of achieved operational skills of Czech Republic armed forces	2008	2012
Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports	LA	INGO	1998	2012
	ME	KONTAKT	1996	2012
	OC	COST	1993	2012
	OE	EUREKA	1993	2012
	OK	EUPRO	1994	2012
Ministry of Agriculture	QH	Research programme in the agrarian sector 2007-2012	2007	2012

LIST OF PROGRAMMES FINISHED IN 2013 (included in evaluation in 2014)

Provider	Programme		Programme duration	
	Code	Name	from	until
		No finished programme is evaluated		

LIST OF PROGRAMMES FINISHED IN 2014 (included in evaluation in 2015)

Provider	Programme		Programme duration	
	Code	Name	from	until
Ministry of Agriculture	QI	VAK (Research in the agrarian sector)	2009	2014

Annex 5

OUTPUTS FROM THE EVALUATION OF FINISHED R&D&I PROJECTS

List of information, which will be listed in individual evaluation output tables. The tables may contain additional auxiliary data.

Table P1

The table contains information about projects of evaluated programmes and their results:

Information about the programme (programme code, provider code);

Information about the project (project code, project name, duration, total recognised costs, state budget support, appreciation code, level of data confidentiality);

Information about the results (total number, number of individual result types).

Table P2

The finished programme evaluation table contains the following data:

Programme designation (code according to the R&D&I IS code list, name),

Provider designation,

Number of evaluated projects,

Solution costs (total, from the state budget),

Number of results,

Number of individual result types.

The information will be sorted by providers.

Annex 6

FIELD GROUP CODE LIST

1	ARTS AND HUMANITIES (SHVa)
2	HUMANITIES (SHVb)
3	HUMANITIES (SHVc)
4	TECHNICAL SCIENCES AND INFORMATICS
5	AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
6	EARTH SCIENCES
7	MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
8	PHYSICAL SCIENCES
9	CHEMICAL SCIENCES
10	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
11	MEDICAL SCIENCES

Annex 7

CLASSIFICATION OF RIV FIELDS INTO FIELD GROUPS

	FIELD GROUP	FIELDS	Field group point share	% share
1	ARTS AND HUMANITIES (SHVa)	AB, AG, AI, AJ, AL	43 920	7,32
2	HUMANITIES (SHVb)	AA, AC, AD, AE, AM	32 460	5,41
3	HUMANITIES (SHVc)	AF, AH, AK, AN, AO, AP, AQ, GA	17 220	2,87
4	TECHNICAL SCIENCES AND INFORMATICS	BC, BD, DH, GB, FS, IN, JA, JB, JC JD, JE, JF, JG, JH, JI, JJ, JK, JL, JM, JN, JO, JP, JQ, JR, JS, JT, JU, JV, JW, JY, KA	101 700	16,95
5	AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES	GC, GD, GE, GF, GK, GG, GH, GI, GJ, GL, GM	29 760	4,96
6	EARTH SCIENCES	DA, DB, DC, DD, DE, DF, DG, DI, DJ, DK, DL, DM, DO	30 360	5,06
7	MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES	BA, BB	22 860	3,81
8	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	BE, BF, BG, BH, BI, BJ, BK, BL, BM, BN, BO	90 480	15,08
9	CHEMICAL SCIENCES	CA, CB, CC, CD, CE, CF, CG, CH, CI	94 800	15,80
10	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	DN, EA, EB, EC, ED, EE, EF, EG, EH, EI	72 000	12,00
11	MEDICAL SCIENCES	FA, FB, FC, FD, FE, FF, FG, FH, FI, FJ, FK, FL, FM, FN, FO, FP, FQ, FR	64 440	10,74

Annex 8

LIMITS OF POINT VALUES AND PERCENTAGES OF INDIVIDUAL RESULT TYPES

Percentages of individual result types were set based on the data from the 2012 Evaluation

Table 8.1 – Limits of point values and percentages of individual result types

	FIELD GROUP	Percentage limits for individual types of publication results					Pillar III [points]	Total limit [points]	
		Jimp	Jsc	Jneimp	Jrec	BC			D
1	ARTS AND HUMANITIES (SHVa)	30%			13%	55%	2%	A1	43920
2	HUMANITIES (SHVb)	30%			15%	53%	2%	A2	32460
3	HUMANITIES (SHVc)	55%			0%	40%	5%	A3	17220
4	TECHNICAL SCIENCES AND INFORMATICS	65%		0%		9%	26%	A4	101700
5	AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES	93%		0%		5%	2%	A5	29760
6	EARTH SCIENCES	95%		0%		5%	0%	A6	30360
7	MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES	92%		0%		3%	5%	A7	22860
8	PHYSICAL SCIENCES	100%	0%					A8	90480
9	CHEMICAL SCIENCES	100%	0%					A9	94800
10	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	100%	0%					A10	72000
11	MEDICAL SCIENCES	100%	0%					A11	64440
TOTAL							105000	600000	

Limit application principles

- 1) Scores for results with application year of 2011 and older remain unchanged.
- 2) For evaluation of results with application year 2012 and above a total annual point value for Pillars I. and III. is set to 600 000 points, which is divided among the Pillars as follows:
 - Pillar I. - 495 000 points
 - Pillar III. - 105 000 points
- 3) The number of points that could be awarded within Pillars I and III in individual field groups is stipulated in Annex 7.
- 4) Pillar III points calculated according to chapter VIII. will be divided among field groups according to the classification of projects to fields. For projects with directed support and countable RU FP7 projects this classification is listed in CEP, for contractual research this classification will be gained from the RO. Then the An values shall be set.

- 5) Point values distributed in Pillar I (for publication results) will be calculated as the remaining part of the total point limit of the given field group (after the deduction of An points).
- 6) Percentage limits in columns Jrec, BC a D are the maximum. If the total point values of the given type calculated according to Table 1.1 in Annex 1 does not reach the percentage allocation for the given field group listed in Table 8.1, this value is considered a limit, i.e. will not be normalized. The remaining points will be transferred to the Jimp results.
- 7) If the total point value of the result of any of the Jrec, B, C or D type exceeds in any field group the percentage allocation listed in Table 8.1 or the value set according to the previous point, the point value of all results of this type is proportionally reduced so that the limit is observed.
- 8) All points for publication results in the given field group shall be proportionally adjusted so that the sum of points for all results will be equal to the number listed in the Total limit column.
- 9) Individual results shall be distributed to appropriate RO.
- 10) In the 2013 evaluation each RO will receive an amount equal to 1/9 of the total point value of results evaluated within Pillars I and III (including results from the years 2008 – 2011 evaluated in previous evaluations). This amount is represented by the $R_k^{(2013)}$ expression from chapter VII.6 for Pillar II. In the following years the amount $R_k^{(N)}$ shall be calculated according to chapter VII.6.
- 11) The final evaluation of RO in year N equals the sum of points the RO received in all years of the evaluated interval within Pillars I and III and for ERC projects plus $R_k^{(N)}$.

VERIFICATION CRITERIA OF EVALUATED RESULTS

Consolidated data shall be used if possible

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
Valid for all result types ¹⁵	Veracity according to § 12 par. 1 of the Act regarding each decisive criterion for individual result types	Listed below for individual result types, always decision: Information not true	Listed below for individual result types
	Description according to § 32 par. 3 of the Act	information not provided or for other than J type results match with the result name or description shorter than 64 characters including spaces	SW algorithm for comparison of two RIV data fields
	Verification of the existence of the result by performing physical check, whether the result exists (e.g. verification that J_{neimp} article was published in the listed periodical – photocopy of the published article, that the result application contract was concluded etc.)	Result does not exist	criteria physically verified for selected results by the provider or expert commissions
	Verification of the application year whether it is not purposefully moved so that the result is included in the interval of evaluated years	the information does not match the year of the result's registration according to databases used for result verification	Search in the appropriate database and SW algorithm for comparison of RIV, CEP and CEZ data fields
	Verification of the application year activity if the result is related to specific research activities (CEP, CEZ), whether the application year does not precede the starting year of the activity	the recorded year does not precede the starting year of the activity	

¹⁵ Including data on contractual research

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
	Verification whether the data on the result of the R&D&I activity are presented by the real owner of the rights to the result, i.e. whether the result is submitted by an author, who has a labour law relation with the submitter, i.e. is a domestic author (if the name of the submitter is presented in other than Czech language, it must be a relevant translation of its official name)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the record does not match the name of the company or submitter registered in the database used for result verification - in case of the result author a different affiliation is listed 	Search in the appropriate database
J – article in specialist periodical	Existing and correct ISSN	Check sum does not match	SW algorithm numeric check
	Affiliation to evaluated databases (see Annex 1)	Periodical not registered	SW search algorithm in the appropriate database
	Number of pages (min. number of pages = 2) (not applied to result type J _{imp} and J _{sc})	Lower number of pages listed	SW verification algorithm via provider
	Indicator Article, Review or Letter?	Indicator is not from the defined group	SW search algorithm in the appropriate database or physical verification
B – specialist book	Existing and correct ISBN	Check sum does not match	SW algorithm numeric check
	Number of pages (min. number of pages = 50)	Lower number of pages listed	SW verification algorithm, physical verification via provider
	Submission of obligatory copies according to § 3 par. 1 of Act No. 37/1995 Coll., on Non-Periodical Publications as amended by Act No. 320/2002 Coll., to the Czech National Library (applicable for books published in the Czech Republic)	Czech National Library does not have the particular ISBN code in its database	Czech National Library database, physical verification
	Expertise – in case of disputed results, whether the book does fulfil the definition of the result, possible expert verification of fulfilment of the definition by an RVVI expert and advisory body	The book does not fulfil the definition of the result	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies
D – article in	Existing and correct ISBN or ISSN	Check sum does not match	SW algorithm numeric check

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
proceedings	Affiliation to evaluated databases (see Annex 1)	Publication not registered	SW search algorithm in the appropriate database
	Number of pages (min. number of pages = 2)	Lower number of pages listed	SW algorithm, external verification in the appropriate database, physical check via provider
P – patent	Decision number (not application No.)	Decision number not registered	Search in the appropriate database and evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies
	Which patent office awarded it	Missing or incorrect internet address of the patent office	
Z – trial operation, verified technology	Is it a manufacturing process?	Description of technical parameters of the result in RIV (data field R37) result not characterized as a manufacturing process	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
	Is a license contract or contract on other use of the result concluded with a specific subject or is the result being used by the owner?¹⁶⁾	The name of the subject, its ID and date of the conclusion of the contract are missing ¹⁷⁾	
	Expertise – in case of disputed results, whether the book does fulfil the definition of the result, possible expert verification of fulfilment of the definition by an RVVI expert and advisory body	Result does not fulfil the definition	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, thorough physical check of the result via provider
	Is it possible to conclude a contract between the beneficiary and the subject that realizes the trial operation or verified technology in production?¹⁶⁾	Description of economic parameters of the result in RIV (data field R38) no economic parameter listed	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider

¹⁶⁾ If the beneficiary and user are other different subjects they have to conclude a contract on the use of results according to § 11 par. 1 of the Act No. 130/2002 Coll. If the user is the same subject this contract is not concluded. In case of a RO the provider must verify the fulfilment of conditions valid for RO according to § 2 par. 2 d) of the Act.

¹⁷⁾ If the result is being used by the beneficiary, information about the beneficiary are provided and economic parameters are not listed.

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
	<p>Is the result defined correctly?</p> <p>Are the annotation and technical parameters listed correctly?</p>	<p>RIV description (data field R42)</p> <p>RIV description (data field R42) and technical parameters of the result (data field R37) are identical</p>	<p>Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies</p>
Z – variety	<p>Granting of rights protection (Act No. 408/2000 Coll., on the protection of plant variety rights and the amendment to Act No. 92/1996 Coll., on plant varieties, seed and planting material of cultivated plants, as last amended, (Act on the protection of plant variety rights)), not the date or application number</p>	<p>data (data field R37) not registered the ÚKZÚZ (Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture) database</p>	<p>Verification in the ÚKZÚZ database, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider</p>
	<p>Result name identical to a variety name in the ÚKZÚZ database</p>	<p>data (data field R06) does not match the variety name in the ÚKZÚZ database</p>	
	<p>Registration to put varieties into circulation is not considered a Z – variety result</p>	<p>ÚKZÚZ registers only the Registration to put varieties into circulation</p>	
Z - breed	<p>Decision No., not application No.</p>	<p>ČPI (Czech Breeding Inspectorate) does not register</p>	<p>Verification in the ČPI database, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider</p>
F – utility model	<p>Decision No., not application No.</p>	<p>The database of the appropriate patent office does not register</p>	<p>Verification in the appropriate database, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider</p>
F – industrial model	<p>Decision No., not application No.</p>	<p>The database of the appropriate patent office does not register</p>	

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
G - prototype	Is the result applied after the verification of the result's properties in practice or at a testing facility prior to the start of serial or mass production?	Description of technical parameters of the result in RIV (data field R37) result not listed as verified for manufacturing process	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
	Is a licence contract or a contract on other use of the result concluded with a specific subject? Is it possible to start the serial production of the prototype?	the name of the subject, its ID and date of the conclusion of a license contract or a contract on another use of the result are missing	
	Is it possible to conclude a contract on the use of the result between the beneficiary and the subject that realizes serial or mass production? ¹⁶⁾	Description of economic parameters of the result in RIV (data field R38) no economic parameter listed ¹⁷⁾	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
G – functional sample	Is the result applied after the verification of the result's properties in practice or at a testing facility and was e.g. a unique instrument manufactured based on this testing?	Description of technical parameters of the result in RIV (data field R37) not characterized that the result was manufactured based on the testing of its properties	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
	Is a licence contract or a contract on other use of the result concluded with a specific subject? ¹⁶⁾ Does a physical result exist or is it just a design?	the name of the subject, its ID and date of the conclusion of a license contract or a contract on another use of the result are missing ¹⁷⁾	
H – Results reflected in legislation and norms	Application = publication in the Collection of Laws, Or for ČSN (Czech technical norms) application = publication of the norm	RIV (data field R75) does not include the regulation number or the listed regulation number is not recorded in the Collection of Laws, , or RIV (data field R75) does not list ČSN or the listed ČSN is not recorded in the database of the normalization office	Search in the counterpart collection of laws database published by the Ministry of Interior, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, or search in the appropriate ČSN database

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
H – Results reflected in directives and regulations of a non-legislative nature, binding within the competence of the given provider	Application = publication in the journal of the provider or another competent body	RIV (data field R75) does not contain the identification of the publication of a non-legislative regulation in the journal of the appropriate ministry or its electronic version	Search in the appropriate ministry database, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
H - Results reflected in the approved strategic and conceptual documents of R&D&I bodies of the state or public administration	Application = publication (e.g. on the Internet) by the provider or another competent body	RIV (data field R75) does not contain identification of the publication of a strategic and conceptual regulation	Search at the provided link, physical check via provider
N – certified methodology, heritage procedure	Is it possible to conclude a contract on the use of the result between the beneficiary and the subject who will use the methodology? ¹⁶⁾	Description of economic parameters of the result in RIV (data field R38) no financial value of results listed, e.g. equal to the price for ownership rights and rights of use of the results ¹⁷⁾	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
	Certification – data field for identification of the awarded certification and the certification authority	RIV (data field R37 a R79)	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
N – treatment procedure	Humane medicine: publication in the Journal of the Ministry of Health	RIV (data field R37) does not identify the Journal of the Ministry of Health	Search in the appropriate ministry database, evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
	Veterinary medicine	RIV (data field R37) does not list the number of the decision on certification of the treatment procedure by a body of the State Veterinary Administration	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider

Result type	Criterion	Description of the use of the exclusion criterion	Verification method
N – specialized map with scientific contents	Is it a map with special content?	RIV (data field R78) no information about the use of the result	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check via provider
R – software	Public availability of the result - availability of the description of the result's functionality and licence conditions for its use	RIV (data field R36)	Evaluation by RVVI expert and advisory bodies, physical check, SW download
		RIV (data field RN3) a requirement of obtaining a licence is listed	
V – research report	Submission via a prescribed method for handling confidential information (see Act No. 148/1998 Coll. on Protection of Classified Information and Amending Certain Acts, Act No. 412/2005 Coll., On Protection of Classified Information and Security Capacity as amended), i.e. the confidential document may only be submitted via a secret record office.	The result was not submitted via a secret record office of the provider	Verification by an eligible employee
V- summary research report	Application = publication (e.g. on the Internet) by the provider or another competent authority	RIV (data field R75) does not contain identification of the publication of the summary report	Search at the provided link, physical check via provider

Note:

- **SW algorithm** – designation of a method of data checking, where the data is checked against a specific database with the use of programme equipment;
- **physical check via provider** – means requesting cooperation of the provider for a specific verification of result data, i.e. providing requested documents related to the result within 10 workdays so that it would be possible to make a qualified decision about its exclusion or inclusion in Evaluation with reference to the regulation § 12 and 31 par. 10 of the Act. If the provider does not cooperate, the result will be excluded from Evaluation;
- **excluded results** – these are results, which will be subsequently removed from the R&D&I IS, i.e. a procedure according to § 14 par. 5 of the act shall be applied to them.

Annex 10

TIME SCHEDULE

The time schedule contains individual dates, which are decisive for the processing of partial and final outputs defined in individual chapters of the Methodology. The listed dates are set in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Act, if the given date falls to a national holiday or other official holiday, the date is moved to the next workday.

I. Evaluation of the results of RO

Description of an action or output	Date	Output presented by	Meant for
Last date to submit information about results of the RO into RIV via the appropriate provider	30th May (included)	Individual providers	RIV
FIRST PHASE OF RO EVALUATION Tables 1, 2. and 2a Working tables J - V	30th June	RVVI R&D&I operator IS	Individual providers and OVHP
SECOND PHASE OF RO EVALUATION Evaluation of OVHP results	From 1st July	-	OVHP
Submission of corrected information according to Tables 1 and 2(or possibly 2a) into RIV; submission of financial data according to Pillar III.	31st July	Individual providers	RVVI
Submission of Working tables J-V after verification of results	by 15th August	OVHP	R&D&I operator IS
THIRD PHASE OF RO EVALUATION Submission of Tables 3, 4 and 5prac with the evaluation results to providers Providers' comments to Tables 3, 4 and 5prac	1st September ¹⁸⁾ 10th October ¹⁸⁾	RVVI Individual providers	Individual providers RVVI
FOURTH PHASE OF RO EVALUATION Settlement of providers' comments and approval of the settlement by RVVI	November RVVI meeting ¹⁸⁾	RVVI	
Approval of the final results of RO evaluation (Table 5) at the RVVI meeting	December RVVI meeting ¹⁸⁾	RVVI	

¹⁸ For 2013 the dates are moved by 1 month, i.e. 1st October, 11th November, December and January RVVI meetings.

The final date for the listing of the contents of current records from all used databases including the ISSN → ISSN-L convertor is the 1st November. RVVI cannot be held responsible for the contents of the listing of current status of individual databases, as it is not their administrator or operator.

II. Evaluation of the results of finished programmes

Description of an action or output	Date	Output presented by	Meant for
Submission of information about the results of programme projects finished in the previous year (150 days period after the project finished) and submission of information about the results of projects, which received support according to § 3 par. 2 a), for which the period for submission is 730 days.	By 7th September (included)	Individual providers	RIV
Providers present to RVVI a summary report on their evaluation of programmes finished in individual years.	By 30th October		RVVI
Processing of information for the evaluation of programmes, Table P1	1st December	RVVI	
Summary evaluation of finished programmes (Table P2) – RVVI's approval of the material and submission of the material into interdepartmental comment process.	January RVVI meeting		
Summary evaluation of finished programmes (Table P2) – submission of the material to the Czech government for discussion.	By 30 th April	RVVI	Czech government