720047/15.12.2025

Final Evaluation Report

PROJECT REGISTRATION CODE
ANC-EPOC-2025-0050

RESEARCH ORGANIZATION NAME
INSTITUTUL DE CERCETARE PENTRU ECONOMIA AGRICULTURII SI DEZVOLTARE RURALA BUCURESTI

RESEARCH ORGANIZATION TYPE
B. Research Organizations - applied research/technological development/innovation (except HE)

PERIOD UNDER EVALUATION
2020-2024

DATE OF VISIT

07.11.2025. 10.00-18.45 Tentative Schedule: 10.00 – 10.15 Organizational Meeting of the Team of Expert Evaluators 10.15-10.45 Meeting Between the Team of Expert Evaluators and the Legal Representative of the Research Organization 10.45-11.15 Meeting Between the Team of Expert Evaluators and the Representatives of the Administrative and Financial Management of the Research Organization 11.15-12.15 Meeting Between the Team of Expert Evaluators and the Representatives of the Scientific Management and the Scientific Council of the Research Organization 12.15-12.45 Meeting Between the Team of Expert Evaluators and Researchers Within the Research Organization 12.45-14.00 General Presentation of the Research Organization • Brief presentation of the self-evaluation report • Presentation of the research organization's development plan 14.00-14.15 Meeting Between the Team of Expert Evaluators and the Heads of Research Departments of the Research Organization 14.15-14.45 Visit to the Material and Research Infrastructure 14.45-15.10 Meeting Between the Evaluation Team and the Members of Various Committees Operating Within the Research Organization 15.10-15.40 Organizational Meeting of the Team of Expert Evaluators Prior to the Final Meeting with the Representatives of the Evaluated Research Organization 15.40-16.00 Meeting Between the Members of the Team of Expert Evaluators and the Representatives of the Evaluated Organization for the Communication of the Evaluation Process Conclusions

Criterion I. DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION ACTIVITY
[max. score: 50]

Indicator I.1 The capacity to attract and manage research funding
[max. score: 17]

Score obtained: 13.33

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization demonstrates its capacity to attract funds from competitively won grants/contracts obtained from national or international organizations/institutions and also to manage the available financial resources.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator I.1 are:
  – Contracts obtained/grants won by the research organization from European/international funds (number);
  – Value of contracts obtained/grants won by the research organization from international organizations/institutions (amounts);
  – Contracts obtained/grants won by the research organization from national organizations/institutions (number);
  – Value of contracts obtained/grants won by the research organization from national organizations/institutions

(amounts);
– The structure of the budget according to the specificity of the research organization over the last 5 years.
- Evaluate mainly the organization's ability to win competitively grants/contracts from national and international organizations/institutions.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR demonstrates strong capacity to attract competitive funding nationally, with 15 ADER contracts totaling over 5.1 million lei in five years. It secured Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe projects, showing international recognition. Budget structure reflects consistent growth and diversification. Active partnerships and experience in managing complex projects enhance credibility. Over 1/3 of income is generated from competitive funds. Institute expects positive results in recently applied projects.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The institute has not established a project office to support reserachers in gaining grants. International funding remains limited compared to national sources. Dependence on sectoral programs reduces resilience of the Institute. Limited visibility and promotion of results may hinder competitiveness in broader EU calls.So far there were no international projects where ICEADR was a leading partner. Due to financial limatitons imposed by the Academy, there is no plan how to cofinance projects, therefore ICEADR are prevented to apply for several funds. No projects awarded under the National Research and Development Plan; all funded projects belong to a single program (the Sectoral Program of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development - ADER) Financial director is not well aware about possibilities to improve finances of the Institute.

Indicator I.2 Organized scientific events
[max. score: 3]

Score obtained: 2.67

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization, in order to disseminate the results of scientific research, has organized, both as coordinator and in partnership with other research organizations, international and/or national scientific events (congresses, conferences, symposia, workshops) or summer schools.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator I.2 are:
  – Organized international scientific events (congresses, conferences, symposia, workshops) or summer schools;
  – Organized national scientific events (congresses, conferences, symposia, workshops) or summer schools.
- Evaluate mainly the organization of international scientific events.
- Note: In the case of international scientific events, a minimum of 20% of participants from abroad is taken into consideration.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR organizes numerous international events annually, including the “Agrarian Economy and Rural Development - Trends and Challenges” symposium and co-organized conferences in Serbia and Turkey, ensuring over 20% foreign participation. It also hosted national seminars and workshops, fostering knowledge exchange and visibility. The consistent presence in international scientific networks strengthens its global profile.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Despite regular events, ICEADR lacks summer schools and large-scale congresses, limiting diversity in dissemination formats. International events rely heavily on recurring partnerships, with limited expansion to new regions or thematic areas. International cooperation in coorganisation of there events is limited just to 3 countries. Promotion and post-event impact measurement remain modest

Indicator I.3 The capacity to develop services, technologies, products

[max. score: 25]

Score obtained: 21.33

- Analyse, relative to the available funding and number of researchers, the extent to which the research organization has societal, economic and social impact demonstrated by the capacity to develop services, technologies, products, reflected, according to the research organization's mission, in products/technologies/ developed/posted methodologies /reports/publications/public interest studies/research services/consultancy/impact studies.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator I.3 are:
  – Products/technologies/processes/methodologies developed through research activities resulting from economic or scientific research contracts;
  – Technologies and services made available to other research centers on a contract/collaboration project basis (including posted in EERTIS - https://eertis.eu/) or Open access;
  – Reports/studies of public interest or with private beneficiaries.
- Evaluate mainly, relative to the scientific research organization's mission, the extent to which the scientific research organization demonstrates the capacity to develop services, technologies, products for public or private beneficiaries through: reports/studies/research services/consulting/software systems for editing, publishing and online consultation of scientific information/theoretical studies with social impact or in other sciences, obtained through competition, commissioned or carried out at the request of beneficiaries, or with social impact or in other sciences proven by official documents/contractual relations/requests/orders.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR shows strong alignment with its mission by delivering over 100 public-interest studies, technical-economic guides, and market analyses for MADR and other beneficiaries. It developed ZooSyst software for farm efficiency and numerous methodologies for crop and livestock management. Services and consultancy are widely requested, proving societal and economic relevance. Outputs are documented through official contracts and published guides. High capacity for developing technical documentation, studies, framework technologies, standard cost estimates, and methodologies, for the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Limited presence of technologies/services in EERTIS and few open-access tools beyond ZooSyst reduce visibility. Innovation is mainly in methodologies, with scarce proprietary technologies or patents. Dependence on commissioned studies constrains diversification toward high-impact, market-driven products. Services to private sector are only occasional. I must be noted that majority of limitaions are due to financial restrictions imposed vy the Academy. A low number of direct private beneficiaries, with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development being the main recipient of services. Limited open-source technologies or technologies made available to other research centers. No service on the EERTIS (https://eertis.eu)

Indicator I.4 Editing and publishing the research organization's own journals or with the involvement of the organization's researchers

[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 0.33

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization demonstrates the capacity to contribute to the process of disseminating the results of quality scientific research by editing and publishing its own journals indexed in Web of Science or other recognized international databases, and the extent to which researchers in the organization are involved in editing and publishing journals indexed in recognized international databases (Web of Science, etc.).
- The performance indicators associated with indicator I.4 are:
  – The research organization is editing and publishing its own journal indexed in Web of Science (Journal Citation Reports Q1/Q2/Q3/Q4, Emerging Sources Citation Index or, in addition, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, for humanities),

SCOPUS;
– The research organization is editing and publishing its own journal indexed in CNCS (A or B) or in another recognized IDB;
– Persons affiliated with the evaluated research organization fulfilling the role of editor-in-chief of a journal indexed in Web of Science (Journal Citation Reports Q1/Q2/Q3/Q4, Emerging Sources Citation Index or, in addition, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, for humanities), SCOPUS;
– Persons affiliated with the evaluated research organization fulfilling the role of editor-in-chief of a CNCS (A or B) indexed journal, for humanities.

- Evaluate mainly, relative to the available resources, the extent to which the research organization demonstrates the capacity to edit and publish its own journal indexed in recognized international databases, and also a high degree of involvement from the researchers in the organization in editing and publishing journals indexed in recognized international databases.
- Note: In the case of journals indexed by Journal Citation Reports, will be taken into consideration the impact factors (IF) or the influence scores (AIS) calculated by Web of Science. The best Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 ranking (between IF and AIS) of the last 5 editions published by Journal Citation Reports relative to the year of evaluation will be considered.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR publishes annually and online journal: Agrarian Economy and Rural Development - Realities and Perspectives for Romania, with the proceedings of the international symposium that it organizes. All the researchers are publishing scientific papers on their specific competences. The Journal is available online since 2010 and is an useful tool for the persons interested in agriculture economics and rural development.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The journal is indexed only in IDB with no impact factor. By common efforts and by attracting important papers, in the future, the journal can be included in Web of Science and other important platforms.

Indicator I.5 The capacity to train young researchers (PhD, postdoc) [max. score: 4]	**Score obtained: 3.17**

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization contributes to the training of young researchers (doctoral and postdoctoral studies) in relation to preparing doctoral theses and postdoctoral fellowships in sectors/departments of the research organization, participations of researchers from the research organization as members of doctoral thesis public defence committees or doctoral thesis guidance committees, researchers working in the research organization with the quality of doctoral supervisor or POSDRU/POCU/MSCA/PNCDI/PNRR projects of postdoctoral and doctoral research won/implemented by the research organization.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator I.5 are:
  – Doctoral theses prepared or postdoctoral fellowships carried out in sectors/departments of the research organization;
  – Researchers affiliated with the research organization, who have participated as members in a doctoral thesis public defence committee or a doctoral thesis guidance committee;
  – Doctoral supervisors working in the research organization;
  – POSDRU/POCU/MSCA/ PNCDI/PNRR postdoctoral and doctoral research projects won/implemented by the research organization;
  – PhD students/postdoctoral researchers within the research organization.
- Evaluate mainly whether the research organization demonstrates that it has contributed to the training of young researchers (doctoral and postdoctoral studies) by having researchers from the evaluated research organization fulfilling the role of doctoral supervisors, the capacity to attract doctoral/postdoctoral researchers in the research organization, the capacity to prepare doctoral theses in sectors/departments of the evaluated research organization, participations of researchers from the research organization as members in doctoral thesis public defence committees and doctoral thesis guidance committees or through POSDRU/POCU/MSCA/PNCDI/PNRR postdoctoral and doctoral research projects won/implemented by the research organization.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

Eleven (11) PhD thesis have been prepared in the institute in the analyzed period, under the coordination of PhD tutors from the universities where they have been affiliated. One research was involved as member in the PhD advisory committee. Three researchers were members in ten (10) PhD committees for thesis public defense, of which, one in an international committee.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

There are no doctoral supervisors at the Institute Only 3 researchers have been members of defense committee There is no program to motivate young reserachers to join institute that could provide various programs for development. Institute needs to communicate with the academy to provide funds to support young researchers.

Criterion II. RESULTS OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY AND IMPACT AT INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL LEVEL

[max. score: 50]

Indicator II.1 Works of wide scope and fundamental importance; books, treatises, encyclopaedias, monographs, coordinated/published/edited studies and chapters; published articles; patents applied/exploited/obtained [max. score: 35]	Score obtained: 25.33

- Analyse the productivity of the research organization, relative to the available resources (including human resources expressed as number of researchers - full-time equivalent), respectively to the funding received by the research organization, from the perspective of the scientific output materialized, according to the specific mission of the research organization in: articles published in indexed journals (Journal Citation Reports Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Emerging Sources Citation Index or, in addition, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, for humanities), SCOPUS, IEEE or CNCS (A or B) indexed, for humanities, treatises/books/monographs published by researchers in the research organization as authors or editors with established international and national publishing houses, chapters in these categories of publications, patents applied/exploited/obtained.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator II.1 are:
  – Articles published in a Web of Science indexed journal (Journal Citation Reports Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Emerging Sources Citation Index or, in addition, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, for humanities), SCOPUS, IEEE;
  – Articles published in a journal indexed in CNSC (A or B), for humanities;
  – Treatises/books/monographs or chapters published by an established publishing house from abroad, as an author;
  – Treatises/books/monographs published by an established publishing house from abroad, as an editor/coordinator;
  – Treatises/books/monographs or chapters published by a CNCS A or B ranked publishing house or by an established publishing house in the country, as an author;
  – Treatises/books/monographs published by a CNCS A or B rated publishing house or by an established publishing house in the country, as an editor/co-coordinator;
  – Registered and published patent applications;
  – Patents applied/exploited at national or international level or exploited at international level (with EU/OECD priority);
  – Variety/breed certificates applied/exploited at national or international level or exploited at international level (with EU/OECD priority);
  – Patents obtained at international (with EU/OECD priority) or national level;
  – Intellectual property, ORDA certificates.
- Evaluate mainly a high level of productivity of the research organization in terms of scientific output, materialized, according to the specific mission of the research organization, in articles published in Web of Science indexed journals (Journal Citation Reports Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Emerging Sources Citation Index or, in addition, for humanities, Arts & Humanities Citation Index), SCOPUS, IEEE or, in addition, for the humanities, articles published in a CNSC (A or B) indexed journal, treatises/books/monographs published by researchers in the research organization as authors or editors

in established international and national publishing houses, chapters in these categories of publications.
- Evaluate mainly patents applied/exploited in the "National Register of Invention Patents", within OSIM, Romania, international patents registered with the European Patent Office (EPO) or the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) or other international patent databases.
- Note: In the case of journals indexed by Journal Citation Reports, impact factors (IF) or influence scores (AIS) calculated by Web of Science will be taken into account. The best ranking Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 (between IF and AIS) of the last 5 editions published by Journal Citation Reports relative to the year of the evaluation will be considered.
- In the case of articles, only those for which the author has indicated the affiliation to the evaluated research organization will be considered.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

CEADR demonstrates solid scientific productivity: 96 articles published in Web of Science and Scopus journals between 2020-2024, with a clear upward trend (from 12 in 2020 to 28 in 2024). It produced 45 books/monographs and 4 edited volumes with CNCS-ranked publishers, reinforcing its visibility. Citations reached 868 in WoS and 70 in Scopus, confirming impact. Outputs align with its mission in agricultural economics and rural development

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

No books or book chapters published by international publishers Most books are published by 1-2 national publishers (e.g., Terra Nostra) Most articles published in one WOS journals edited by MDPI -25% (Sustainability - 16%) and Romanian journals - 59% (in one Romanian journal Scientific Papers Series "Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development - 47%) No registered national or international patents

Indicator II.2 Papers and communications presented at scientific events
[max. score: 5]

Score obtained: 3.50

- Analyse, relative to the specificity of the organization, the extent to which the research organization's scientists disseminate the results of their own research at prestigious scientific events.
- The performance indicators associated with indicator II.2 are:
  – Papers presented at an international scientific event, published in a volume indexed in Web of Science - Conference Proceedings Citation Index (CPCI-S), Conference Proceedings Citation Index - Social Science & Humanities (CPCI-SSH), classified IEEE proceedings;
  – Papers presented at an international scientific event, published in an edited volume with ISBN (non - WoS);
  – Invited/keynote papers presented at an international scientific event;
  – Invited /keynote papers presented at a national scientific event.
- Evaluate mainly, relative to the specificity of the field, the high degree of dissemination of the organization's scientific research results through the participation of researchers in prestigious international scientific events and the publication of their presentations in Web of Science (WOS) or ISBN (non-WOS) indexed conference proceedings, and invitations as keynote speakers at national and international scientific events.
- Note: In the case of papers presented at scientific events, will be taken into consideration only those for which the author has indicated the affiliation with the research organization.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The number of papers presented in a volume indexed Web of Science increased from 1 in 2020 to 4 in 2024, to a total of 11. The number of papers presented and published in an edited volume with ISBN reached a total of 96, for the analyzed period. 7 papers have been presented as invited papers.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Low number of keynote speakers. Some of those reported as keynote or guest speakers are regular presentations (e.g., 2023 Belgrad) Most of the papers presented and published in proceedings are from international conferences held in Romania; a few are from conferences outside Romania. Most are included in the proceedings of the institution's own conference.

Indicator II.3 Visibility and impact of the published work
[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 8.00

- Analyse the scientific visibility and impact of the research organization's publications through the number of citations in WOS, SCOPUS, IEEE indexed journals or, in addition, for the humanities, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, in CNCS (A or B) indexed journals and books (excluding self-citation).
- The performance indicators associated with indicator II.3 are:
  - Number of citations accumulated by the research organization during the evaluated period in the following databases:
    - Web of Science;
    - SCOPUS; IEEE;
    - in addition, for the humanities Arts & Humanities Citation Index, in CNCS (A or B) indexed journals and books.
- Evaluate mainly the identification of a significant number of citations, in the evaluated period, of papers published by the research organization in journals indexed in WOS, SCOPUS, IEEE or, in addition, for humanities, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, in journals indexed CNCS (A or B) and books, regardless of the year of publication of the cited work.
- Note: In the case of citations, only those for works published by the author affiliated with the evaluated research organization will be taken into consideration.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR achieved strong visibility with 868 citations in Web of Science and 70 in Scopus during 2020–2024, plus nearly 4,000 citations in Google Scholar, reflecting growing international recognition. Citations increased significantly year-on-year, confirming impact and relevance of research in agricultural economics and rural development. High citation counts for works in sustainability and bioeconomy underline alignment with global priorities. There is a very good distribnution of citations among researchers

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Citation concentration in a few high-impact articles suggests limited breadth of influence. Modest presence in Scopus indicate room for diversification. Greater focus on Q1 journals and collaborative publications could enhance global reach. Most of the citations in MDPI and Romanian edited journals

Criterion III. MANAGEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY
[max. score: 40]

Indicator III.1 Quality management system (certified by authorised institutions)
[max. score: 3]

Score obtained: 3.00

- Analyse whether the organization has a developed, approved and implemented an internal quality management regulation or procedure, a quality manual and other specific procedures, as well as whether the research organization has been accredited by institutions authorised in the field of quality management.
- Evaluate mainly whether the organization has a quality management regulation or procedure in place, a quality manual, a procedure for managing risks and opportunities and, in general, the existence of quality procedures for the activities carried out.
- The maximum score is awarded when the research organization provides proof of ISO 9001 accreditation from an

authorised institution.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The Institute has a quality management system certification according to ISO 9001:2015 (certificate series C-MC, no. 5557/13.11.2024), obtained in November 2024. The institute demonstrates strong commitment to quality through ISO 9001:2015 certification, obtained after rigorous internal and external audits. Operational procedures align with international standards, ensuring transparency, efficiency, and continuous improvement. This system enhances credibility, fosters stakeholder trust, and supports high-quality research outcomes.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

No weaknesses have been identified on this criterion.

Indicator III.2 Regulations, rules, procedures implemented by the research organization
[max. score: 2]

Score obtained: 1.83

- Analyse whether the research organization has updated organizational and operational regulations and an internal regulation according to the legal provisions in force, regulations/procedures developed, approved and implemented for research activity management, employee performance evaluation, integrity, equal opportunities, etc.
- Evaluate mainly the high degree of implementation of regulations, rules and procedures and the high degree of confidence in the Internal Managerial Control System (SCIM) of the research organization.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

Internal managerial control systems have been developed covering wide range of activities. Evaluation of Individual Professional Performance is prepared annualy. The Institute has 31 regulations, rules, procedures and plans implemented for different aspects of its activity. The institute has established a comprehensive regulatory framework that ensures transparency, accountability, and efficiency. Internal procedures cover risk management, performance evaluation, human resources, and document archiving, aligning with best practices. These measures strengthen governance, support research integrity, and foster a predictable organizational climate.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The Internal Management Control System is ensured by only one person.

Indicator III.3 Ethics and academic integrity in research
[max. score: 5]

Score obtained: 5.00

- Analyse the existence of a code of ethics, a research ethics committee, a specific procedure for the functioning of the committee and the extent to which the committee proves its functionality in case of complaints.
- Evaluate mainly whether the research organization has a code of ethics, an ethics committee operating procedures developed, approved and implemented, the existence of an ethics and academic integrity committee and documents attesting to the functioning of the ethics committee, in case of complaints.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The Institute applies the Code of Ethics and Integrity of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences and Forestry "Gheorghe Ionescu Sisești" approved in 10.09.2020. The activity is assured by the Ethics and Integrity Commission, composed of a president, 3 members and a secretary. During the analyzed period, 2 complains have been registered and solved. A functional ethics committee operates within the institute, with the mission of monitoring and promoting compliance with the Code of Ethics and Integrity.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

No weaknesses have been identified for these criteria

Indicator III.4 Research infrastructure related to the mission and objectives of the research organization (how the infrastructure sustains the mission of the research organization)
[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 8.17

- Analyse the extent to which the infrastructure sustains the research organization's mission and the degree of development of the research-development and innovation infrastructure relative to the activities carried out within the organization.
- Evaluate mainly whether the research infrastructure is appropriate to the research organization's mission, a high degree of its development, and the existence of an investment strategy and plan.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The Institute has IT equipment, both hardware and software. These include a high-performance server, performant workstations, data storage and processing equipment, as well as specialized software solutions for data analysis and modeling, research project management, and efficient team collaboration. A specialized person for the management of IT sector is enrolled. There is also a library with quite a high number of volumes. The Institute has an Annual Public Procurement/Investment Plan.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The infrastructure is not included in the national RoadMap or linked with international research networks Infrastructure is not in EERTIS system Total investment for 5 years is only 160,000 Lei, which is not sufficient for sustainable growth and ambitious targets that have been set. Support by the funder is needed.

Indicator III.5 The research organization as a member in scientific networks/associative bodies
[max. score: 5]

Score obtained: 3.83

- Analyse the capacity of the research organization to integrate into research networks and associative bodies, as evidenced by concluded agreements/protocols and other documents provided by the organization on the functionality of the partnerships, with a focus on joint submission and winning of projects, organization of joint scientific events, development of scientific publications, etc.
- Evaluate mainly whether the research organization has collaboration agreements/protocols in place, as well as whether there is documentary evidence that they are functional (submission and winning of projects in partnership, organization of scientific events in partnership, joint preparation of articles/studies/books, etc.).

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The Institute signed 14 agreements for the submission and winning of projects within HORIZON 2020 and HORIZON Europe. An important partnership is signed with IFCN (International Farm Comparison Network) -

The Dairy Research Network with 130 partners from 125 countries. Protocols are signed with 4 foreign institutions from Serbia, Poland, Bulgaria and Moldova, and with 4 Romanian institutions for the organization of joint international scientific events.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Networks are mostly made on an ad-hoc basis, serving just for one project application. There are no partners from Western Europe in organisation of conferences. No protocols have been submitted

Indicator III.6 Accredited or non-accredited testing, trials, analysis laboratories; Open access libraries and databases created/administered, to the extent that funding was available [max. score: 10]	**Score obtained: 6.33**

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization is equipped with laboratories for tests, trials, analysis and their accreditation status or the existence of their own libraries, Open access databases and the intensity of access, in correlation with the field in which the research organization is active and the available funds.
- Evaluate mainly whether, relative to the funds available and the field in which it operates, the research organization has laboratories for testing, trials analysis, and whether they are accredited or whether it has its own library or Open access databases and whether there is evidence that the scientific information in the library or Open access databases has been accessed.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR has two specialized research laboratories aligned with its mission in agricultural economics and rural development, supported by modern IT infrastructure and specialized software (SPSS, EViews, XLStat, Vensim, SimaPro). It maintains a well-equipped library with over 1,000 volumes and an open-access database hosting 200+ ISI articles and 50 books. Continuous updates and free online access to research outputs demonstrate commitment to knowledge dissemination.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Institute does not provide access for researchers to WoS and Scopus journals' articles (ANELIS). No information on databases created and whether they are available in an open-access format. No accredited testing laboratories exist, limiting experimental validation capacity. Open-access resources lack detailed evidence of usage intensity, and absence from EERTIS reduces visibility. Further development of interactive platforms and accreditation could enhance impact

Indicator III.7 Degree of digitalization of the research organization [max. score: 3]	**Score obtained: 2.67**

- Analyse whether, relative to the research organization's mission and in correlation with the current standards in the field, the IT infrastructure is adequate for the researchers' work, and the extent to which the research organization has an updated website with the results of the research carried out in the research organization available in an open access regime.
- Evaluate mainly whether the IT infrastructure is appropriate to the research organization's mission, the research organization has a website in Romanian and English and, in correlation with the available funds, the website is updated with research results published in an open access regime.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR's IT infrastructure is robust and aligned with its mission, featuring 15 desktop units, 15 laptops, servers, high-speed wireless network, and specialized software for statistical analysis, modeling, and sustainability assessment. The website is bilingual (Romanian/English), regularly updated, and provides open-access to over 200 ISI articles, 50 books, and detailed project information, ensuring transparency and knowledge dissemination. ZooSyst software products are freely available.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

While the infrastructure supports research needs, interactive tools and advanced data-sharing platforms remain limited. Evidence of user engagement with open-access resources is not systematically tracked. Further integration of collaborative digital tools could enhance impact.

Indicator III.8 Innovation Management System

[max. score: 2]

Score obtained: 1.50

- Analyse whether the organization has an approved and implemented innovation management regulation/procedure and whether it has organized its own technology transfer centre.
- The maximum score is awarded when the research organization provides evidence of accreditation/certification of the innovation management system by an authorised institution and the establishment/operation of a technology transfer centre.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The certification of the innovation management system according to SR 13572:2016 (no. CIT/73/1/02.04 2025) was granted in 2025 The innovation management system is ensuring structured processes for creativity, technology transfer, and continuous improvement. This certification reflects a proactive approach to fostering innovation, aligning research with market needs, and strengthening competitiveness in the agri-food sector.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The innovation management certification system was obtained after the evaluation period. There is no dedicated department or technology transfer center.

Criterion IV. PERFORMANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT

[max. score: 25]

Indicator IV.1 The extent to which the activity responds to public interests of national or local importance

[max. score: 5]

Score obtained: 4.17

- Analyse, relative to the research-development field, and the available funding and human resources, the organization's capacity to coordinate or participate in the development of studies, sectoral projects, research projects of local or national impact; research services for or in partnership with commercial entities.
- Evaluate mainly the coordination of or participation in the development of complex works with national and local economic/social impact.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR has proven capacity to coordinate and implement complex projects with national impact, leading 14 ADER sectoral projects funded by MADR (over 8.2 million lei) and participating in Horizon Europe initiatives. It delivered numerous studies and technical-economic guides supporting agricultural policy, food security, and climate adaptation. Collaboration with public authorities and private beneficiaries demonstrates strong societal and economic relevance.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Limited services are provided to private organizations or research services in cooperation with private entities. Institute should provide more research services on a commercial basis. This requires change in contractual terms with the Academy

Indicator IV.2 The capacity to develop national and international collaborations
[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 7.17

- Analyse the capacity of the research organization to develop national and international collaborations that have as main outcomes the joint use of components of the research infrastructure, providing access to researchers from other research organizations to different components of its own infrastructure (including IOSIN); provide support services for other research organizations or researchers from outside the organization, co-opting partner organizations or researchers from other organizations in initiated projects.
- Evaluate mainly the evidence of a high degree of joint use of infrastructure with other research organizations, providing access to components of the research infrastructure for researchers from other research organizations, providing services to other research organizations or researchers from other research organizations, as well as attracting researchers or research organizations in inter- and trans-disciplinary research projects.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR demonstrates strong collaborative capacity through 14 national partnership agreements and participation in Horizon Europe projects. It provides access to specialized software, economic models, and internal databases for partners, enabling joint research and validation of methodologies. Shared use of IT infrastructure and co-organization of scientific events confirm openness to inter- and transdisciplinary collaboration The Institute cand be reliable partner for the other Research Institutes and Station within ASAS and Romanian Academy network, since in many national and international projects. Partner access to proprietary databases, econometric models, and specialized software programs.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

ICEADR is missing the list of all suport services provided. More support services' contracts are necessary to ensure sustainable income growth. More international fellowships and studies a re necessary Institute has limited funds to support networking. It shoudl develop a plan how to overcome budgetary limitations. International cooperation is limited to two institutions (Serbia and Moldova).

Indicator IV.3 The contribution to national and international experimental development and innovation
[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 7.00

- Analyse the works identified by the research organization as being of reference for science in terms of the contributions made by the research organization through these works, and the evidence of recognition of their impact by the national and international scientific community; analyse the results of applied research and patents identified by the research organization as having economic impact.
- Evaluate mainly the publication of reference works in the respective field, e.g. handbooks; books in the most prestigious

publishing houses; results highlighted, e.g. on the cover of prestigious journals, organization of activities to disseminate results of scientific work through large-scale events/studies/reports with proven prestige in the national and international scientific community; experimental development works/patents for or in partnership with the economic environment.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The research team of the Institute, has an important activity at national level, the results being presented and published at national and international scientific events. Most of their studies are the important sources for the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, the Institute being recognized at national level as the main provider of economic data regarding agriculture and rural area. The Institute has an important cooperation with other specialized research entities - institutes and research stations from Romania.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

No patents or experimental development outputs were reported, limiting technological transfer and economic impact. International recognition through top-tier publishers and high-profile editorial roles remains modest. Expanding innovation outputs and partnerships with industry could strengthen applied research impact.There is no other evidence on the impact on development and innovation. No evidence of economic impact is provided

Criterion V. HUMAN RESOURCES

[max. score: 15]

Indicator V.1 Staff structure by scientific grade and the share of PhD supervisors, and career development opportunities

[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 8.00

- Analyse the career development opportunities offered by the research organization to its members, the structure of the scientific research staff by scientific grade, the number and share of PhDs, PhD supervisors, the quality of the research team as a whole and the extent to which it is appropriate for the mission and activities carried out by the research organization.
- Evaluate mainly the career development opportunities offered to researchers within the research organization, a balanced structure of total staff and research staff by scientific grade, a high number and share of PhD supervisors.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

Balanced staff structure in relation to scientific ranks. High proportion of PhD holders. Members of ASAS (honorary and associate). Staff with a high Hirsch index The Institute has a number of 17 researchers of different levels. The number of Doctor in Sciences increased from 9 in 2020 to 16 in 2024. 11 PhD thesis have been elaborated through research activities in the Institute with the involvement of the research team and by using the local infrastructure

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

There are no formal PhD supervisors at the institute As of the end od 2025 there are no PhD students employed. It is necessary to prepare a plan to attract more young researchers

Indicator V.2 Members in the editorial board of a national/international journal (rated by Web of Science, SCOPUS) or in the editorial board of an established international publishing house; members in an international think tank/expert group at European/global level; members (fellow, senior) of an international scientific society
[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 0.67

- Analyse how the researchers from the research organization, through their results and their prestige, contribute to increasing the visibility of the research organization, of the Romanian scientific research in the respective applied field, at international and European level.
- For the period under evaluation, evaluate mainly the presence of the researchers from the research organization in the editorial boards of prestigious national and international journals, in the editorial boards of established international publishing houses, in international think tanks/expert groups at European/global level, their membership (fellow, senior) in prestigious international scientific societies in the field.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

Members of the editorial board of WOS-indexed and national journals. Researchers are also guest editors of some WOS journals. Members of national and international professional associations from the agriculture and economics fields.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Cooperation mostly established with MDPI journals Only one researcher is permanent member of editorial board Only 3 reserachers are members of scientific societies Limited representation in top-tier publishing houses and global think tanks reduces international prestige

Indicator V.3 Members in the management/scientific board of an international organization or association in the field
[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 0.00

- Analyse how the research organization and the Romanian scientific research benefit from increased visibility and prestige through the representatives of the research organization in the management/scientific board of prestigious international organizations/associations.
- For the period under evaluation, evaluate mainly the presence of researchers from the research organization in the management/scientific board of prestigious international organizations/associations.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The strenghts regarding this section are very limited

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The institute has limited representation in the management or scientific boards of prestigious international organizations, with only 3 researchers taking part. This restricts its influence on global research agendas, reduces visibility in decision-making forums, and limits opportunities for strategic networking and shaping international collaborations. Representation in permanent boards of global associations remains limited, reducing long-term influence

Indicator V.4 Members/experts in joint committees/working groups of public authorities at national level
[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 1.00

- Analyse how the research organization, through its researchers, has been involved during the period under evaluation in solving current societal problems.
- For the period under evaluation, mainly evaluate the presence of researchers from the research organization as members or experts in joint working groups/committees set up by public authorities at national level for the substantiation and preparation of draft legislation, strategies and policies, action plans, policy papers, etc.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

Six researchers are members in seven Thematic Working Groups of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. Their contribution is extremely valuable as experts in economics and rural development. The Institute provides a high number of useful information regarding the agricultural production, resources, market and rural area dinamics.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Participation is limited to a few experts, reducing the breadth of institutional representation

Indicator V.5 Members of a doctoral school; members (fellow, senior) of a national scientific society; members in the scientific/editorial board of a prestigious national journal
[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 0.50

- Analyse the degree to which the research organization, through its researchers, is recognized in the academic environment and in society for its ability to contribute to the coordination and quality enhancement of the training of doctoral students, to the development of knowledge in the specific research field, to the maintenance of high quality standards and respect for ethics and academic integrity in the specific research field.
- For the period under evaluation, mainly evaluate the membership of researchers from the research organization in doctoral schools as coordinators/mentors, their presence as members in national scientific societies in the specific research field, in scientific/editorial boards of prestigious journals, etc.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR researchers actively contribute to doctoral training as mentors and advisory committee members, ensuring high standards of ethics and academic integrity. Some researchers are members of steering committess and journal editors.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The Institute has not yet any member as PhD coordinator. Only one researcher is a member of the PhD supervising committee and only 2 are members of the PhD defence committees The situation can be overpass by the habilitation of 2-3 researchers at the Doctoral Schools of some universities as University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest and the Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest.

Indicator V.6 Awards/distinctions/titles
[max. score: 1]

Score obtained: 0.50

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization's prestigious results and researchers have been recognized in the period under evaluation by established national and international forums, state institutions and authorities, international and national scientific societies, universities, following selection processes, etc.

- Evaluate mainly the recognition of researchers' results and their professional prestige by national and international established forums, through awards/distinctions/titles, namely: award of the Romanian Academy; award/distinction granted by state institutions/authorities; award (distinction) of a national scientific society obtained through a selection process; award (distinction) of an international scientific society obtained through a selection process; Doctor Honoris Causa title awarded by a university, etc.
- Note: Awards for research results (PRECISI) will not be considered.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

One researcher received the Prize SERGIU HARTIA, of the Academy of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences (ASAS) „Gheorghe Ionescu-Șișești" in 2020, for a scientific paper. There is an straight competition at ASAS level for the annual prizes and one prizes is given once in the lifetime.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

Low number of received prizes. It could be improved by the participation at the competition of the other members of the Institute

Criterion VI. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE EVALUATED PERIOD AND FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS

[max. score: 20]

Indicator VI.1 The quality and feasibility of the proposed strategic objectives relative to the research organization's mission and the field in which it operates

[max. score: 10]

Score obtained: 8.17

- Analyse: the feasibility of the strategic objectives and the extent to which the proposed strategic directions support the achievement of these objectives, in line with the research organization's mission; the quality of the institutional strategic plan for the evaluated period and for the following 5 years; the quality of the SWOT analysis of the research organization relative to the environment in which it operates; the extent to which the organization's research directions are aligned with those specific to the national and European research, development and innovation space and to the field in which the research organization operates, and the extent to which the human resources policy is in line with the requirements of the European Charter for Researchers, the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, and the commitment to the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers - HRS4R.
- Evaluate mainly whether the presented objectives are feasible, appropriate and the proposed strategic directions of development support their implementation relative to the research organization's mission, there is a realistic Institutional Strategic Plan and appropriate for the research organization's mission, and there is a high degree of correlation of the specific research directions of the research organization with the specific directions of the national and European research, development and innovation space.
- Evaluate mainly the alignment of the organization's human resources strategy with the requirements of the European Charter for Researchers, the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and the commitment to the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R).

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

The proposed plan demonstrates a strong alignment with the mission and European Union priorities, particularly in areas such as digitalization, bioeconomy, and sustainability. This alignment not only ensures the relevance of the initiatives but also enhances the potential for accessing EU funding streams, which are increasingly tied to these strategic objectives. A notable strength of the plan is its comprehensive coverage of key areas. By addressing four strategic domains—Agricultural Economics, Rural Development, Digital Transformation, and Bioeconomy—the plan effectively tackles both traditional challenges and emerging issues within agriculture and rural development. This breadth of focus positions the initiative as forward-thinking and adaptable to evolving sectoral needs. The structure of the plan is another critical advantage. Each strategic area is supported by clearly defined general and specific objectives, which provide a solid framework for monitoring progress and evaluating impact. This clarity facilitates accountability and ensures that stakeholders can track achievements against measurable targets. Sustainability and competitiveness are central themes throughout the plan. Emphasis on organic farming, integrated management practices, and bioeconomy initiatives underscores a commitment to long-term resilience and environmental stewardship. These priorities align with global trends and respond to societal demands for greener and more sustainable agricultural systems. The inclusion of a robust digital transformation component further strengthens the plan. By prioritizing ICT adoption and the development of digital skills, the strategy aligns with modernization trends and enhances operational efficiency across the sector. This focus on technology ensures that agricultural practices remain competitive in an increasingly digital economy. Finally, the plan's feasibility is reinforced through its emphasis on partnerships and knowledge transfer. Collaborative projects and stakeholder engagement are highlighted as key mechanisms for successful implementation. These partnerships not only pool resources and expertise but also foster innovation and shared learning, increasing the likelihood of achieving the plan's ambitious objectives.

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The proposed strategic plan demonstrates ambition by addressing multiple domains; however, several structural and operational weaknesses may hinder its effectiveness. The plan spans four major strategic areas, which risks diluting resources and focus. Without clear prioritization, it is difficult to determine which objectives are most urgent or impactful, potentially leading to fragmented implementation. A significant gap lies in the absence of proper key performance indicators (KPIs), and detailed funding allocations for each objective. These omissions make it challenging to monitor progress and ensure accountability, reducing the likelihood of successful execution. Dependence on External Factors The strategy relies heavily on partnerships, European Union programs, and policy support, however with no clear path how to ahieve them. Although digital transformation is highlighted as a priority, rural areas often face infrastructure and connectivity limitations. These barriers could impede adoption and undermine the intended benefits of digitalization initiatives. There is a risk of unsure funding sources for the next period. Transitioning to a bioeconomy entails systemic changes and active stakeholder engagement. The plan does not sufficiently address risk mitigation or capacity-building strategies, leaving critical gaps in its approach to managing socio-economic complexities. While digital skills receive some attention, broader training and capacity-building for farmers and rural communities remain underdeveloped. Strengthening human capital is essential for sustainable implementation and long-term impact. At this point of time the Institute has reduced number of young researchers

Indicator VI.2 The extent to which the scientific and institutional objectives are correlated with relevant trends in the organization's scientific field and societal needs [max. score: 10]	**Score obtained: 8.00**

- Analyse the extent to which the research organization provides an appropriate framework to keep researchers up-to-date with the latest developments in the field, conducive to innovation and technology transfer; the extent to which the scientific and institutional objectives of the research organization are in line with the relevant trends in the scientific field in which it operates and with the real needs of society.
- Evaluate mainly the support for innovation and technology transfer; the initiative to set up an international scientific advisory board of the research organization; a high degree of correlation regarding the scientific and institutional objectives with relevant national and international trends in the organization's scientific field and societal needs.

COMMENT - STRENGTHS

ICEADR ensures alignment with scientific trends and societal needs through strategic objectives focused on bioeconomy, digitalization, and sustainability. Researchers have access to updated resources, specialized software, and international collaborations, fostering innovation and technology transfer. Participation in Horizon Europe projects and national sectoral programs confirms responsiveness to EU priorities. Continuous modernization of IT infrastructure and open-access dissemination support knowledge transfer. The Institute's partnerships with other research units, educational institutions, authorities, and the private sector facilitate knowledge transfer and practical application of research results. Investments in IT infrastructure enable researchers to use advanced tools and technologies, supporting digitalization and innovation. The Institute monitors scientific trends and societal challenges (e.g., sustainability, food security, digitalization) and adapts its objectives accordingly. This flexibility ensures relevance and responsiveness. Future research directions—such as promoting innovation, digitalization, and environmental sustainability—are aligned with EU objectives and societal needs, reinforcing the Institute's strategic vision

COMMENT - WEAKNESSES

The plan suggests financial or structural constraints that may hinder full implementation of initiatives, such as comprehensive access to international training or cutting-edge technologies. No international scientific advisory board has been established, limiting external strategic input. Technology transfer remains modest, with few proprietary innovations or patents. Greater integration of collaborative platforms and proactive engagement in global innovation networks would enhance impact. Although partnerships are mentioned, there is no clear description of formal processes or dedicated units for technology transfer (e.g., innovation hubs, IP management offices). Adaptability is noted, but reliance on periodic reviews rather than real-time strategic adjustments could slow responsiveness to rapid scientific and technological changes. Some KPI indicators are below the reference values for the 2020–2024 period. There is limited access to continuous training programs in cutting-edge fields Participation in conferences is positive, but without systematic international collaborations or advisory structures, the Institute may struggle to maintain global leadership. There is no yet a plan to set up an international scientific advisory board. To have such an important body is essential for the future evolution of the Institute.

Criterion VII. CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VII.1 Conclusions/recommendations

- General conclusions and/or recommendations

ICEADR has established itself as a strategic research institution in agricultural economics and rural development, with strong national impact through policy-support studies and sectoral projects. Recent years show a positive evolution in performance, largely due to effective leadership and the Scientific Board's efforts. The institute provides essential scientific and technical support to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR), reinforcing its role in shaping agricultural policies. Strengths: - Consistent scientific productivity with publications in indexed journals and growing citation trends. - Modern IT infrastructure and open-access resources. - Functional research infrastructure supporting national projects. - Strategic positioning as a key actor in agricultural policy implementation. Challenges: - Legislative and financial constraints, including partial salary coverage and austerity measures, limit researcher motivation. - Limited international visibility, patent output, and technology transfer. - Low English proficiency among some senior researchers reduces participation in international projects. - Restricted access to specialized literature and international databases. - Current organizational structure has reached its capacity for growth. Opportunities for Improvement: 1. Internationalization & Visibility: - Expand global collaborations and partnerships, including diaspora engagement and Western European institutions. - Organize joint events, guest lectures, and study visits with universities and international partners. - Launch a specialized journal aiming for Scopus and Web of Science indexing within three years. - Create an open-access repository linked to CrossRef and develop proprietary databases in agricultural economics. 2. Human Capital Development: - Implement English language training programs. - Support postdoctoral enrollment and habilitation for senior researchers. - Attract and retain young researchers through career development, mobility programs, and international summer schools. - Establish a youth-led team to drive methodological improvements and collaborative research. 3. Funding & Innovation: - Diversify funding sources and strengthen project portfolio, including EU funds. - Create a project office to assist with international applications and funding opportunities. - Develop structured mechanisms for technology transfer and industry partnerships. - Negotiate access to platforms like Anelis Plus for updated literature. 4. Organizational Changes: - Introduce two sectors: one for scientific excellence and another for technology transfer. - Form an international advisory board to guide strategic research directions. 5. Knowledge Dissemination: - Valorize national outputs through guides, brochures, and booklets for farmers and associations. Strategic Goal: To keep high future performance thresholds (e.g., 150 points in five years and continued increase in number of researchers with high level of excellence and impact), ICEADR must implement these measures, ensuring alignment with EU priorities and societal needs

Total Score: 155,17

Evaluator 1 (Rapporteur): ZUBOVIC JOVAN

Signature: _

Evaluator 2 : STANICA FLORIN

Signature: _

Evaluator 3 : POPA IONEL

Signature: __