



June 3, 2021

Dear members of evaluation committee,

Your effort to provide a realistic perspective on our institute is greatly acknowledged. We more or less do agree with the evaluation report that provides a valuable feedback. However, we would like to comment on some points of the report.

First of all, we cannot agree with the negative comments on institute reorganization which came into force in 2018 and also with claimed overall rigid structure of the institute. The reorganization provided smaller, more focused units. The leaders were encouraged to direct their research activities towards challenging up-to-date topics. On the other hand, it was also requisite to fulfil all the past commitments associated mainly with the running projects. This partially led to duplication of the research as it was identified by the committee. The institute management will definitely focus on this issue in the next period. The reorganization is still not finished and will continue in the next period taking into consideration also results of this evaluation. Promising young scientists are continuously being encouraged to establish their own research teams and submit a research concept to the Board of the institute for approval. The institute management will also create conditions to attract junior group leaders from abroad. Special care will be paid to women researches to correct the gender imbalance especially in leading positions. The clustering of the cooperating researches into one research unit was one of the aims of the reorganization. This, on the other hand, was reflected in decreased apparent interaction between individual departments. We believe that the reorganization and the measures applied have been positively reflected in the institute performance at the end of the evaluated period and this trend will continue in the next period.

In the next period, a special attention will be paid to the combined research-service departments. The service activities will be shifted more to the non-research staff which will work under adequate supervision. The status of the departments will be probably changed as recommended by the committee.

The recommendation to transfer some of the departments into other institutes seem to be logical, seemingly leading to higher effectiveness. However, this is beyond the management's competencies and the transfer of the infrastructure, employees etc. seems to be unlikely. Although, some of the research direction seems to be duplicated within CAS, the research performed in ICPF is characterized by unique combination of fundamental and applied research.

In the next period, the institute management will increase the support of the selected, most promising research directions which will ultimately lead to increased visibility and competitiveness on an international level. Last but not least I declare that the course of the evaluation was in compliance with the Methodology of evaluation of research and professional activity of research-oriented institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for the period 2015–2019.

Yours sincerely,

Miroslav Punčochář  
director