



ORDER

September 11, 2013

256

Moscow

On amending Foundation President's Order No. 107 dated October 16, 2012 On Approval of the Regulation on the Expert Boards of the Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies

Pursuant to the Regulation on the Assignment and Termination of the Participant Status within the Project for the Establishment and Operational Support of the Skolkovo Innovation Center as approved by the decision of the Foundation Council of June 21, 2012 and agreed with the Foundation's Board of Trustees on September 12, 2012, and the Regulation on Grants for the Participants in the Project for the Establishment and Operational Support of the Skolkovo Innovation Center as approved by the decision of the Foundation Council of April 25, 2012 and agreed with the Foundation's Board of Trustees on April 25, 2012,

I hereby order that:

1. The Appendix to Foundation President's Order No. 107 *On Approval of the Regulations on the Expert Boards of the Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies* dated October 16, 2012 (as amended by Foundation President's Order No. 183 dated June 18, 2013) be modified to read as set out in Appendix 1 hereto.
2. This Order should enter into force on the date of its signature.
3. The implementation of this Order should be followed up by A.L. Burenin, Senior Vice President for Economics and Finance.

Chairman of the Foundation Board

V. F. Vekselberg

Appendix to Order No. 256 of Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies dated September 11, 2013

Appendix to Order No. 107 of Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies dated October 16, 2012

**REGULATION
ON THE EXPERT BOARDS OF
NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
THE FUND FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF THE CENTER FOR ELABORATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION
OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES**

1. General Provisions

Clause 1. Subject Matter and Terms

1. This Regulation defines the procedure for the running of the Expert Boards of the Foundation.
2. In their operation, the Expert Boards shall be governed by the Law, the Foundation Charter, Regulation on the Status, Regulation on Grants, and this Regulation.
3. The terms used in this Regulation have the following meanings:
Questionnaire: the term defined in Paragraph 4 of Clause 4 of the Regulation on the Status;
Affiliate: a close relative of the expert; a corporate entity (including an Applicant; a Project Participant; or a Co-investor of a Project Participant) in which the expert and/or his or her close relatives act as: an employee; a project team member; the head (a deputy head); a member of the governance bodies and/or collegiate deliberative bodies; a founder (member) (regardless of the interest size);

Beneficiary: an individual who directly or indirectly (by owning stakes (shares) in the registered capital of other corporate entities who are members in a legal entity) controls the operations of such a corporate entity;

Business experts: experts specializing in appraising the commercial component of projects and having management experience in major companies, including investment firms or entrepreneurial experience in high technologies;

Close relatives: parents (including adoptive parents), children (including adopted children), spouses, siblings and half-siblings, grandchildren, grandparents, uncles, aunts, nephews, and nieces;

Evaluation Form: a project evaluation form in the format set out in Appendix 1 hereto;

Benefit: tangible benefit in cash or in kind that can be viewed as income under Russian tax laws, or other benefit expressed in the achievement of unequivocally personal objectives. Business promotion and incentives are not personal benefits;

GC: Grants Committee of the Foundation;

GEO: Grant and Expert Office of the Foundation;

Grant Memorandum: the term defined in Paragraph 1 of Clause 3 of the Regulation on Grants;

Grant Recipient: the term defined in Paragraph 1 of Clause 6 of the Regulation on Grants;

Day: a business day;

Law: Federal Law No. 244-FZ *On the Skolkovo Innovation Center* dated September 28, 2010;

Innovation Priorities: the innovation priorities approved by an order of the Foundation in line with Paragraph 1 of Clause 2 of the Regulation on the Status, with one Innovation Priority per subparagraph of the list of Innovation Priorities. For the purposes of this paragraph, a subparagraph means a numbered part of the list that does not include any numbered components;

Cluster: a cluster of the Foundation that covers the project of the relevant Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient);

Areas of operation: areas defined in Part 8 of Article 10 of the Law;

Research Experts: experts specializing in the evaluation of the research component of projects and having experience of working at scientific and/or research institutions;

Feedback Form: the term defined in Paragraph 2 of Clause 5 and Paragraph 6 of Clause 10 of the Regulation on Grants;

Report: the term defined in Paragraph 1 of Clause 1 and Paragraph 1 of Clause 9 of the Regulation on Grants;

Regulation on Grants: the Regulation on grants to be issued to participants in the project for the establishment and operational support of the Skolkovo Innovation Center approved by the decision of the Foundation Council of the Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies dated April 25, 2012;

Regulation on the Status: the Regulation on the Assignment and Termination of the Participant Status within the Project for the Establishment and Operational Support of the Skolkovo Innovation Center as approved by the decision of the Foundation Council of June 21, 2012 and agreed with the Foundation's Board of Trustees on September 12, 2012;

Grants Procedure: the procedure for interaction between structural units of the Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies regarding grants to be issued to participants in the project for the establishment and operational support of the Skolkovo Innovation Center for an amount exceeding RUB 5,000,000, approved by an order of the Foundation;

Applicant: a corporate entity that has filed an application in line with the Regulation on the Status, or an individual or a corporate entity that has filed an application for a preliminary examination under the above Regulation;

List of Experts: a list of experts that comprise the Expert Boards approved by the Foundation's Director, Head of the Grant and Expert Office (hereinafter the GEO Director) individually for each Focus Area;

Status Expert Board: an Expert Board convened to make an examination to determine whether the Applicant's project meets the Requirements under the Regulation on the Status;

Engineering Experts: experts specializing in the evaluation of the engineering component of projects and having experience in running research and development projects and/or projects to implement engineering solutions in major companies;

Requirements: the requirements set out in Subparagraphs 2 to 6 of Paragraph 1 of Clause 2 of the Regulation on the Status;

Project Participant: the term defined in Paragraph 1 of Clause 1 of the Regulation on Grants;

Foundation: the Non-Profit Organization the Fund for Development of the Center for Elaboration and Commercialization of New Technologies;

Expert Board: a group of experts selected in line with this Regulation from the List of Experts for the purposes set out in the definition of the term SEB herein, and to make an examination of the Grant Memorandum (Clause 5 of the Regulation on Grants), including after amendments (Sub-paragraph 2 of Paragraph 4 of Clause 5 of the Regulation on Grants) and modifications (Paragraph 2 of Clause 7 of the Regulation on Grants) and after examination and evaluation of the Report (Paragraph 6 of Clause 10 of the Regulation on Grants), and if need be, by participating in the actual verification of the contents of the Report for reliability carried out by the Foundation, including by visiting the places of residence and/or operation of the Grant Recipient (Subparagraph 2 of Paragraph 7 of Clause 10 of the Regulation on Grants), and other issues as may be provided for in local regulations of the Foundation.

Clause 2. List of Experts

1. The expert boards include experts from the List of Experts that comprises individuals selected through public procedures, who have signed an expert board member agreement with the Foundation.

2. The List of Experts contains the following information for each expert specializing in a specific Focus Area:

1) his or her specialization in terms of Innovation Priorities;

2) whether he or she is a Research Expert, an Engineering Expert or a Business Expert. An expert may specialize in several Innovation Priorities and can be a Research Expert, an Engineering Expert and a Business Expert at the same time.

For each Innovation Priority, there must be at least 30 experts, and since June 1, 2014 at least 60 experts (to convene a Status Expert Board). Experts selected for each Innovation Priority must meet the requirements set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Requirements as to what experts must be included in the List of Experts depending on the Focus Area

Minimum number*		Energy efficiency and energy saving, including innovative energy technologies	Nuclear technologies	Space technologies, primarily in telecom and navigation systems (including relevant ground infrastructure)	Medical technologies related to the development of equipment and medicines	Strategic computer technologies and software
Research experts	For SEB	15	12	12	18	7
	For an Expert Board in other cases indicated in paragraph 31 of Clause 1 herein	15	12	12	18	7
Engineering experts	For SEB	9	12	12	6	17
	For an Expert Board in other cases indicated in paragraph 31 of Clause 1 herein	9	12	12	6	17
Business experts	For SEB	6	6	6	6	6
	For an Expert Board in other cases indicated in paragraph 31 of Clause 1 herein	6	6	6	6	6

* Since June 1, 2014, the minimum number for experts (for SEB) will be determined by making amendments to this Regulation for each Focus Area before the above date.

3. The procedure for interaction between the Foundation's structural units in holding public procedures to select experts, preparing, agreeing, approving, amending and publishing the List of Experts, and preparing, agreeing, signing, amending, executing and terminating agreements on the performance of the functions of an Expert Board member is set out in the relevant Regulations to be approved by an order of the Foundation.

4. An expert may give the Foundation an electronic notice of his or her inability to take part in meetings of Expert Boards for a certain period (from 5 to 80 days). Within one day after receipt of such notice, SEB must send the expert a confirmation that the notice has been received after which the expert will not be included in Expert Boards called within the period in which the expert is unable to take part in meetings of Expert Boards.

5. Experts have the right to remuneration in the amount set out in an agreement with the Foundation on the performance of the functions of an Expert Board member.

6. Experts must abide by the highest ethical standards in all matters related to examinations made by them under this Regulation.

An expert (Expert Board member) interested in an Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient) or doubting his/her impartiality must notify the Foundation of this by providing relevant information in the Evaluation Form (if participating in SEB meeting) or in the Feedback Form (if participating in **GEB** meeting) and refrain from taking part in the examination.

In case of failure to abide by this requirement, the Foundation may remove such expert from the List of Experts. The procedure for striking experts from the List of Experts is set out in the Regulations indicated in Paragraph 3 of this Clause.

An expert (Expert Board member) is considered to be interested in an Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient) if the expert (or their affiliates) benefits or may benefit depending on the decision of the Expert Board, or cease to be impartial (being prejudiced for or against the Applicants, Project Participants, or Grant Recipients), specifically for any of the following reasons:

1) the expert (Expert Board member) and/or their affiliates are directly related the Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient), its competitors, Beneficiaries, creditors, key team members and/or managers, or are themselves an Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient), a creditor, a key team member and/or manager;

2) the expert (Expert Board member) and/or their affiliates have employment or other contractual relations with the Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient), its competitors, Beneficiaries, creditors, key team members and/or managers or had such relations at any time within the five years preceding the meeting of the Expert

Board;

3) the expert (Expert Board member) and/or their affiliates may have other reasons to receive cash or other compensation from the Applicant (Project Participant; Grant Recipient), its competitors, Beneficiaries, creditors, key team members and/or managers, including in the form of a position in the governance bodies of the above corporate entities.

The Evaluation Form (Feedback Form) sent by such an Expert Board member must not be counted when adding up the results of the Expert Board's meeting under Paragraph 4 of Clause 5 and Paragraph 1 of Clause 8 of this Regulation.

II. SEB Meetings

Clause 3. Calling SEB Meetings

1. An individual SEB meeting is called to examine each application (project) by the GEO Director or a person designated by the GEO Director when the Foundation decides to submit the Applicant's application to SEB for an in-depth examination.

SEB are randomly selected from the experts in the List of Experts for the Innovation Priority determined in line with Subparagraph 2 of Paragraph 4 of Clause 2 of the Regulation on the Status.

2. Calling SEB meetings assumes that the SEB members will be selected, the Applicant's Questionnaire and the Evaluation Form will be distributed to its members (by including links to said documents in the relevant e-mails). The Applicant's Questionnaire and Evaluation Forms are considered to be received by all SEB members on the day they are sent to the last SEB member on the list.

3. Any SEB consists of 10 members. The make-up of each SEB must meet the requirements set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Requirements for SEB composition depending on each Focus Area

Minimum number	Energy efficiency and energy saving, including innovative energy technologies	Nuclear technologies	Space technologies, primarily in telecom and navigation systems (including relevant ground infrastructure)	Medical technologies related to the development of equipment and medicines	Strategic computer technologies and software
Research experts	5	1	4	6	2
Engineering experts	3	1	4	2	5
Business experts	2	2	2	2	3

Clause 4. SEB Meetings

1. SEB meetings must be held in absentia. SEB members participate in the meeting by filling out Evaluation Forms.

2. Any SEB member may refuse to vote by indicating his or her refusal in the Evaluation Form.

The Evaluation Form submitted by such SEB member will not be counted in the voting results under Paragraph 4 of Clause 5 of this Regulation.

3. SEB members must vote within 10 calendar days of receiving the Evaluation Forms by filling out and returning said forms by electronic means of communication to the Foundation.

The Evaluation Form must contain an explanation for the SEB member's conclusion regarding each Requirement (between 100 and 1,000 characters). At the discretion of GEO and subject to approval by the Foundation's Legal Department, the inclusion of sets of letters or characters (including spaces) that do not form individual words, or repeating words or expressions that have no obvious meaning may be rejected as an explanation for the SEB member's conclusion.

Unless the SEB member's Evaluation Form contains an explanation, the SEB member is considered not to have participated in the meeting.

The Evaluation Form may indicate which information about the project and/or documents have not been provided, but were necessary to appraise its compliance (noncompliance) with the Requirements.

Clause 5. Summarizing the Results of SEB Meetings

1. SEB members who have failed to send filled out Evaluation Forms to the Foundation within the timeframe specified in Paragraph 3 of Clause 4 of this Regulation, and SEB members who have failed to vote on at least one item specified in the Evaluation Form are considered not to have participated in the meeting.

Only “yes” and “no” answers contained in Evaluation Forms submitted by SEB members that have participated in the meeting shall be counted in the results of the voting.

2. If less than five members have taken part in the SEB meeting, than the meeting is considered to be void.

3. The new meeting of the SEB shall be called by the GEO Director or a person designated by the GEO Director in line with the procedure set out in Clause 4 of this Regulation, within 2 business days after the previous meeting of the SEB is declared void.

The new SEB must comprise the SEB members who have submitted filled out Evaluation Forms to participate in the SEB meeting that has been declared void, and whose Evaluation Forms have been counted in the voting results, and new SEB members selected in line with the procedure set out in this Regulation.

The Evaluation Forms of SEB members submitted to participate in the SEB meeting that has been declared void and counted in the voting results are not to be resubmitted.

4. The decision on the project’s compliance with a Requirement is to be made by the SEB separately and will be considered to have been taken if at least 60% of the SEB members who have participated in the meeting vote for such decision.

5. The results of SEB meetings with filled out Evaluation Forms enclosed thereto shall be recorded in minutes to be signed by the GEO Director or a person designated by the GEO Director, within one business day after the end of the SEB meeting.

III. The Procedure for Appraising a Grant Memorandum or a Report

Clause 6. Calling an Expert Board to Appraise a Grant Memorandum or a

Report

1. Within 2 days of getting a GEO decision to have a Grant Memorandum appraised, the Cluster may send the GEO a list of experts recommended for inclusion in the Expert Board from the List of Experts.

Within 3 days after the decision to have the Grant Memorandum or a Report appraised, the GEO must prepare a list of experts to be included in the Expert Board from the List of Experts. This list includes:

- 1) all Experts specializing in the relevant Innovation Priority;
- 2) Experts proposed by the Cluster;
- 3) Experts specializing in related Innovation Priorities.

This list must not include Experts:

1) Who have been reported by the Project Participant (Grant Recipient) or the Cluster to have related interests (Paragraph 6 of Clause 2 of this Regulation);

2) who have given the Foundation electronic notice of their inability to take part in meetings of Expert Boards within the period in which the **GEB** meeting is to be held, as per Paragraph 4 of Clause 2 of this Regulation.

2. Within 3 days of the date of the decision to have the Grant Memorandum or Report appraised, the GEO will with due care select at least 8 Experts who have the most relevant expertise for the examination from the list of Experts mentioned in Paragraph 1 of this Clause. The relevance of Experts is determined against the following criteria:

- 1) An Expert may take part in no more than two examinations at a time;
- 2) Where possible, Reports should be appraised by Experts who appraised the relevant Grant Memorandum or previous Reports by this Project Participant;
- 3) International experts should participate in examinations of projects aimed at international markets.

3. Within 3 days from the date of the decision to have the Grant Memorandum or Report appraised, the GEO shall send at least five most relevant Experts from the list indicated in Paragraph 2 of this Clause a letter inviting them to take part in the examination. The letter must specify the name of the Project Participant (Grant Recipient) and the name of its innovation project, and include a summary of the

project.

4. For the purposes of meeting the timeframe for examining Grant Memoranda and Reports set out in the Regulation on Grants, if the GEO fails to receive a reply from an Expert to the invitation within 5 business days, the Expert will be considered to have refused to participate in the meeting of the Expert Board.

5. If fewer than three Experts accept the invitations sent out to them as per in Paragraph 3 of this Clause, the GEO shall send invitations to other Experts on the list indicated in Paragraph 2 of this Clause. The invitations are to be sent until at least three Experts accept the invitation to participate in the examination.

6. No later than on the next business day after the receipt of confirmation by an Expert that he or she will participate in the examination, the GEO must give the Expert access to the materials of the Grant Memorandum or Report required for the examination by sending them a login and password to access the relevant ftp-server (before an automated system is implemented). If the Expert encounters technical problems in accessing the ftp-server, the materials may be made available to the Expert by any other means that prevent access to the materials by third parties.

Clause 7. Conducting an Examination of a Grant Memorandum or a Report

1. Experts shall appraise a Grant Memorandum or a Report in absentia by filling out a Feedback Form.

2. The Feedback Form shall be sent to the Experts along with access to materials of the Grant Memorandum or Report as per Paragraph 6 of Clause 6 of this Regulation.

3. Experts shall fill out Feedback Forms and send them by e-mail to the Foundation either within 15 days after receiving the Grant Memorandum and enclosures or within 20 days after receiving the Report.

4. When sending Experts the materials indicated in Subparagraph 6 of Clause 6, the GEO must also explain to them that they can submit follow-up questions and/or requests for further information to the GEO within 5 days.

The procedure for interaction between structural units regarding getting answers from the Project Participant (Grant Recipient) to follow-up questions and/or requests

for further information from experts is set out in the Regulation on Grants.

Answers to questions and/or additional information received from the Project Participant (Grant Recipient) shall be forwarded by the GEO to the relevant Expert no later than on the next day after being received by the GEO.

Clause 8. Summarizing the Results of an Examination of a Grant Memorandum or a Report

1. Experts who fail to send the Foundation filled out Feedback Forms within the timeframe set out in Paragraph 3 of Clause 7 of this Regulation (in the absence of notice on factors that prevent them from sending their Feedback Forms on time), and who fail to indicate the final score for at least one of the sections specified in the Feedback Form will be considered not to have participated in the examination.

Only answers “Excellent”, “Good”, “Satisfactory”, “Unsatisfactory”, “Yes” and “No” provided in Paragraph 2 of Clause 5 and Paragraph 6 of Clause 10 of the Regulation on Grants and contained in the Feedback Forms of the Experts who have participated in the examination shall be counted when adding up the results of the examination.

2. If fewer than three Experts who agreed to take part in the examination have submitted their Feedback Forms to the Foundation within the timeframe and did not give notices of factors that prevent them from sending their Feedback Forms on time, the GEO shall send invitations to participate in the examination to other Experts in the list indicated in Paragraph 2 of Clause 6 of this Regulation.

If an Expert supplies a notice of factors that reasonably could have prevented him or her from submitting his or her Feedback Form on time, specifying when the Feedback Form will be submitted to the Foundation, the GEO shall send an invitation to the next Expert in the list indicated in Paragraph 2 of Clause 6 of this Regulation only if the potential number of Feedback Forms less the Expert in question is less than three.

3. Within one day of receiving Feedback Forms from at least three Experts, the GEO shall forward them to the structural units listed in the Regulation on Grants and the executive secretary of the Grants Committee together with a letter addressed to the

executive secretary notifying the secretary of completion of the examination of the Grant Memorandum or on examination of the Report by experts.

Similarly, the GEO shall send all Feedback Forms received from other Experts after the first three ones within one day of receiving them.

Clause 9. Additional Requirements for In-depth Examination of Applications (Center for Applied Research)

1. In-depth examinations (Center for Applied Research) are to be made in the same manner and timeframe as set out in Clauses 6 to 8 of this Regulation. The Feedback Form for Experts is provided in Appendix 2 hereto. No follow-up questions and/or requests for further information from Experts will be forwarded to the Applicant, while it will be explained to the Experts that the Foundation is unable to request further information from the Applicant.

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Project: [Project name]

Applicant: [Applicant's name]

Expert: [full name of the Expert Board member] (if you are not the person indicated here, please contact us).

Date: [current date]

[REFUSE TO VOTE \(hyperlink\)](#)

[Notify OF YOUR INTEREST IN THE APPLICANT \(hyperlink\)](#)

Please fill out this Project Evaluation Form:

1. Do the proposed product and/or technology have potential competitive advantages over their global counterparts?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

2. Do the proposed product and/or technology have considerable commercialization potential at least in the Russian market, and potentially later in the global market?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

3. Is the project theoretically feasible and compliant with fundamental scientific principles?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

4. Do key project researchers, developers and managers (the Project Team) have the

necessary expertise and experience to successfully implement the project?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

5. Does the Project Team have an expert or several experts who have international experience in research, development and/or commercialization of R&D products?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

6. Are the submitted materials sufficient to appraise the project? (yes/no)

Please specify which project information and/or documents have not been submitted to you, but are necessary to adequately appraise the project:

FEEDBACK FORM

Project: [Project name]

Applicant: [Applicant's name]

Expert: [full name of the Expert Board member] (if you are not the person indicated here, please contact us).

Date: [current date]

[REFUSE TO VOTE \(hyperlink\)](#)

[INFORM OF YOUR INTEREST IN THE APPLICANT \(hyperlink\)](#)

Please fill out this Feedback Form:

1. Does the expected result of the Applied Research offer a considerable commercialization potential at least in the Russian market, and potentially later in the global market?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

2. Do key project researchers, developers and managers (the Project Team) have the necessary expertise and experience to successfully implement the project?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

3. Does the Project Team have an expert or several experts who have international experience in research, development and/or commercialization of R&D products?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

4. Is the project implementation plan reasonable and does it provide for commercialization of the results of the Applied Research?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

5. Does the project provide for third-party financing (not by the Foundation) no later than two years after the submission of the application for a Project Participant Status by the Applicant, and is [information on the possibility, amount and timeframe for such financing] reasonable?

(yes/no)

Please explain your answer:

6. Are the submitted materials sufficient to appraise the project?

(yes/no)

Please specify which project information and/or documents have not been submitted to you, but are necessary to appraise the project:

--

_»