

## EXPERT'S WORK ASSESSMENT SHEET

<b>Expert's full name</b>	
<b>Full names of the persons responsible for assessment, name of organisational unit</b>	
<b>Date of the assessment of the quality of expert's work</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>No later than 3 calendar days from receiving the results of the ordered work - as regards panellists,</i></li> <li>- <i>14 calendar days - as regards individual opinion/review;</i></li> <li>- <i>14 calendar days from the completion of the audit - in the event of orders including an audit;</i></li> <li>- <i>7 calendar days - as regards all other cases</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Expert's role</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> A panel review of a co-financing application (assessment using criteria 1-4) <input type="checkbox"/> An audit (assessment using criteria 1-4)* <input type="checkbox"/> Review/individual opinion ( <u>assessment only using criterion 1</u> ) <input type="checkbox"/> A panel review in the course of project implementation and in the durability period (assessment using criteria 1-4) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please indicate) <i>[no entry]</i>
<b>The subject of assessment</b> <i>(Application number in the event of reviews as part of selecting applications for co-financing, agreement number in the remaining cases)</i>	

Assessment criteria			Score**
1	<b>Substantive preparation</b>  <b>Quality of recommendations and statements</b>  <b>Reliability</b>	The expert is familiar with the current programme and call documentation. The expert has read the application/documentation, and presents reliable, matter-of-fact and precise recommendations/justification. The expert makes statements on a given topic in a matter-of-fact and precise way. The score/grade given is coherent and consistent with the justification.	0-5 points

		<p>The reasoning is substantive, logical, matter-of-fact, coherent, based on facts and reliable data, and includes all the circumstances which would contribute to a given grade.</p> <p>The opinion which the expert prepared refers to the contents of documentation and is based on an in-depth analysis.</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the expert's work indicates that the expert is not familiar with the programme and call documentation, the maximum score in this criterion is 2 points.</i></p>	
2	<p><b>Cooperation with NCBR</b></p> <p><b>Timely completion of work</b></p>	<p>The expert communicates with an NCBR employee efficiently (responds to e-mails, answers phone calls, etc.). The expert shows a proactive approach to explaining any doubts which might arise and to supplementing any missing information. The expert notifies about his/her (non-) availability in reasonable advance.</p> <p>The expert delivers the results of the entrusted tasks within time limits defined under legal regulations and procedures, or within time limits agreed upon with NCBR employees. The expert report any possible problems with meeting the set deadlines in advance.</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the expert fails to meet the deadline for the performance of works without presenting a reliable reason, or communication with the expert is difficult, the maximum score in this criterion is 2 points.</i></p>	0-5 points
3	<p><b>Cooperation within the expert group /audit team</b></p>	<p>The expert efficiently communicates with other group/team members, and strives to reach a common objective. The expert can communicate verbally (or in writing, where required) information relevant to a given position, maintaining the required form of statements and respect for the remaining group members and their views. The expert expresses his/her views in a precise and understandable way. The expert maintains the logic and cohesion of statements. The expert is an active listener and provides feedback on an ongoing basis.</p>	0-5 points

		<i>NOTE: If the expert does not respect the views of other group members, the maximum score in this criterion is 1 point.</i>	
4	<b>Representing the institution</b>	<p>The expert communicates with the applicant/contractor in a calm and controlled way. The expert's statements are understandable and adjusted to the level of recipients, and the expert's conduct is characterised by impeccable manners and care for the image of the institution. The expert complies with the provisions of the code of ethics (i.a. suitable and toned-down attire).</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the experts behaves in an aggressive way and does not respect for the other party, the maximum score in this criterion is 0 points.</i></p>	0-5 points

<b>Additional remarks</b> (to be completed if the expert showed some unique achievements or violated the rules in a material way)	
--	--

\* Where the audit is conducted by one expert, criteria no. 1, 2 and 4 are subject to assessment (the average score given to an expert for audit is calculated on the basis of 3 criteria)

\*\* The score may be given in increments of 0.5 point.

THE FINAL ASSESSMENT OF ORDER PERFORMANCE BY THE EXPERT	
The average score based on criteria subject to assessment for a given expert's role (rounded up)***	
<b>Score**</b>	<b>Description</b>
0 - 1.49	Requirements fulfilled at an unsatisfactory level (negative assessment)
1.50 - 2.99	Requirements fulfilled at a low level
3.00 - 3.49	Requirements fulfilled at an average level
3.50 - 3.99	Requirements fulfilled at a good level
4.00 - 4.49	Requirements fulfilled at a very good level
4.50 - 5	Requirements fulfilled at an excellent level

\*\*\* In the event of expert's assessment for "review/individual opinion" - the score is equal to the number of points obtained in Criterion 1.