FULL PROPOSALS (POLICY DRIVEN): SUBMISSION CONTENT FOR APPLICANTS VERSUS EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR INDIVIDUAL REMOTE EVALUATORS

These guidelines consist of two columns, describing the required submission content and the criteria for the evaluation of project proposals.

- If you are an **APPLICANT**, you will find the submission content guidelines on the **LEFT**
- If you are an **EVALUATOR**, you will find the evaluation criteria guidelines on the **RIGHT**

SUBMISSION CONTENT GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICANTS	EVALUATION CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATORS
• **Applicants are required to fill in the corresponding sections of the proposal** • **The different sections can be found as online fields within the online platform** • **Texts must be comprehensive, to the point, and focused on the specific criteria**	• **Evaluators are required to mark the specified criteria** • **Specific comments must be provided for each selection criteria** • **The comments must be comprehensive, to the point and focused on specific positive and/or negative aspects explaining/justifying the attributed appreciation** • **The comments must avoid summarising the research proposal content**

Information detail	
Title of the proposal **Acronym of the proposal** **Research Priority of the call** **Duration of the project** (In months). **Budget** **Contribution to SDG goals** **Contribution to Open Access and Open Data** **Integrity in the conduct of research** **Proposal summary (1 page).** **Keywords (6)**	**Note**: This section does not require an evaluation.

SECTION A: SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

1. Scope	1. Scope
1.a. Compliance with the scope of the call	**1.a. Compliance with the scope of the call**
Explain how the project will contribute to the scope of the call (1 page).	**IN / OUT of scope evaluation** Please indicate whether the project proposal is in scope, partially out of scope or totally out of scope: **Note:** • If you consider the proposal as 'OUT of scope', your evaluation ends here. • If you consider the proposal 'IN scope' OR 'partially OUT of scope', you must complete the rest of the evaluation. • Proposals 'partially OUT of scope' may only be financed based upon the agreement of the Panel, who may impose adequate adjustments for it to be 'IN scope'.
1.b. Position of the project regarding the state of the art	**1.b. Position of the project regarding the state of the art**
Indicate whether the project intends to go beyond the state of the art in terms of topic and methodology or stay within the existing state of the art but provide novel information for Belgium. Note that the proposal will be evaluated according to the position of the project in relation to the state of the art. Please put 'x' in the cells which are relevant to your project; filling out multiple lines is allowed. The meaning of the 'x' is explained within the table.	Applicants must put 'x' in the cells relevant to their project; the meaning of the 'x' is explained within the table. The proposal should be evaluated according to the position of the project in relation to the state of the art.

Positioning of the project regarding the state of the art…	Within	Beyond / Innovative
…in terms of topic	*Catching up (in Belgium) on an existing body of international evidence*	*Exploring a gap in international research*
…in terms of methodology	*Reproducing an existing methodology*	*Exploring new methodology*

And elaborate on your choice (1/2 page).

2. State of the art	2. State of the art
2.a. State of the art	**2.a. State of the art**
Describe the state of current knowledge at national and international level on the topic of the project (1 page).	This section does not require an evaluation.
2.b. Bibliographic references	**2.b. Bibliographic references**
List the list of relevant publications mentioned in point 2.a. State of the Art (2 pages).	This section does not require an evaluation.

3. Research Objectives	3. Research Objectives
3.a. List of project objectives	**3.a. List of project objectives**
Briefly list the objectives of the project.	This section does not require an evaluation.
Objective A	
Objective B	
Objective C	
...	
3.b. Description of the objectives	**3.b. Description of the objectives**
Explain the objectives of the project in relation to the state of the art (current knowledge at national and international level on the topic) (2 pages).	Are the research objectives clear and coherent?

4. Methodology	4. Methodology
Provide a detailed description of the methodology (used methods, techniques, systems and/or way of working) to achieve the foreseen results, considering the different disciplines mobilised. Detail how your approach will enable to gather the expected results/deliverables) (10 pages).	Evaluate the approach undertaken. Not all projects need to be original or innovative, but the approach undertaken must be adequately explained (**Point 1.a and 1.b.**). → *E.g. A non-original project can be deemed 'excellent' even if it is not innovative, provided there is adequate argumentation.*

5. Research Ethics	5. Research Ethics
Fill out the following form. Research involving activities marked with an asterisk (*) in the first column require the advice of the ad hoc Board at the level of their institution and an official agreement delivered by the Belgian competent authorities. All relevant authorisations from the specific ethics committee have to be obtained before the beginning of the project. When conducting surveys, interviews, or focus groups where personal information is gathered and stored, data storage, protection, and other relevant issues have to be explained in the data management plan.	Asses the awareness of ethical issues of the project and ways to deal with these using appropriate channels (Ethics form).

Humans	YES	NO
* Does the project or the project data involve humans (children, patients, volunteers, vulnerable people) as subjects?	☐	☐
Human Embryo/Foetus	**YES**	**NO**
* Does the project or the project data involve human embryos?	☐	☐
* Does the project or the project data involve human foetal tissues/cells?	☐	☐
* Does the project or the project data involve human embryonic stem cells?	☐	☐
Human Cells and/or Tissues	**YES**	**NO**
Does the project or the project data involve the use of human cells or tissues (other than from human embryos and/or foetuses)?	☐	☐
Genetic Resources	**YES**	**NO**
Does your research use genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge covered by access and benefit sharing legislation and / or Nagoya protocol?	☐	☐
Privacy	**YES**	**NO**
Does the project involve collecting and/or processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	☐	☐
Does the project or the project data involve tracking the location or observation of people?	☐	☐
Animals	**YES**	**NO**
Does the project or the project data involve research on animals?	☐	☐
* Are those animals non-human primates?	☐	☐
Environment, Health and Safety	**YES**	**NO**
Does your project or your project data involve any activities dealing with elements that may cause harm to the environment, animals, or plants (e.g., GMO plants, microorganisms, etc.)?	☐	☐
Does your project or your project data involve the use of elements (toxic chemicals, explosives, radioactive material, etc.) that may cause harm to humans, including the research staff?	☐	☐
International collaboration	**YES**	**NO**
Does your research involve international collaboration with non-EU countries?	☐	☐
Security	**YES**	**NO**
* Could your research have dual-use or military applications?	☐	☐
* Could your research be misused, compromise security and or human rights?	☐	☐
Artificial Intelligence	**YES**	**NO**
Does your research involve Artificial Intelligence?	☐	☐
Other Ethical Issues	**YES**	**NO**
* Are there any other foreseen activities that may raise ethical issues or that should be taken in consideration?	☐	☐
If yes please specify: *Free text – limited extension, ½ page.*		

Please explain the ethical issues. In the absence of ethical issues, please provide a brief explanation of why there are none (1 page).

6. Gender dimension in the research	6. Gender dimension in the research
Consider the relevance of sex/gender in relationship to the research topic; the way in which the methodology of the project ensures that (possible) sex/gender differences will be investigated; that sex/gender differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the project; that differentiated outcomes and impact of the research have been considered in relation to sex/gender; that samples or test groups are sex/gender balanced; that data are analysed according to the sex/gender variable. Include intersectionality whenever appropriate (1 page).	Assess how the project considers aspects and/or issues related to gender/sex in the proposed research.

SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL

7. Workplan	7. Workplan
7.a. Gantt chart	**7.a. Gantt chart**

Complete BELSPO's **GANTT chart (available on the website)** in accordance with the description of the detailed work plan, tasks and deliverables above:
• Work intensity of each partner within each task (expressed in person-month [PM])
• Include for each partner the person-months funded by the S4Policy project and the person-months funded by other sources (see notes).
 	
Notes:
• The Gantt chart includes funded & non-funded partners.
• 1 Person-month [PM] = 1 full-time equivalent [FTE] or 2 half-time equivalents over 1 month.
• Other sources of financing may include: salary payment by institutions other than BELSPO and/or via other projects, voluntary contributions, etc.
→ Attention: If a given task requires 7 person-months, and only 6 months will be financed by the S4Policy project (BELSPO), the 7th month must be included under 'Person-months other sources' instead of 'Person-months BELSPO'.
• Compulsory work packages:
   - Coordination, project management and reporting
   - Data management
   - Dissemination
	Is the work planning (time schedule, duration and person-power effort per task) appropriate and feasible to run the project? Is it well-distributed among partners in function of their expertise? (horizontal lecture of the GANTT chart, not going into detail for each partner, with recommendations regarding the length and pertinence of the activities within the calendar)
	
	If the proposal is deemed 'reasonable' or 'good', please describe the necessary/possible improvements within the comments.
	
	Note:
	The online submission platform automatically checks the specific rules for the budget repartition in terms of staff, operating costs, overheads, equipment, subcontracting and international research partners – thus, there is no need to check the compliance with the financial rules.

7.b. Work plan description	**7.b. Work plan description**
WP= Work Package; T =Task; D =Deliverable Describe the work plan of the project in Work Packages, Tasks and Deliverables, assigning one leading institution for each Task. Add as many lines as needed to each work package, and as many Work Packages are required. Link the Deliverables to the list of objectives in section 3.a. Remember that WP Coordination, WP Data Management, and WP Valorisation (of deliverables), are compulsory.	Notwithstanding work intensity and duration of tasks and WP, assess the way the breakdown of the work plan in work packages and tasks enables the realization of the project. **Note:** The WP dissemination is not evaluated here, but later in **Point 12**. Provide an overall assessment of the requested level of person-power of each partner throughout the work packages and tasks (vertical lecture of the **GANTT chart**, with recommendations regarding the intensity of their activities and pertinence of participation in them).

WP 1: [Insert here title of the Work Package]	

T.1.1.	*[Insert here title of the task]*	
	[Insert here task leader's institution]	
	[Insert here brief description of the task]	
	D.1.1.1	*[Insert here the title of Deliverable and state the objective it is linked to – cfr 3.a. List of project objectives]*
	D.1.1.2	
	D.1.1.3	
T.1.2.	*[Insert here title of the task]*	
	[Insert here task leader's institution]	
	[Insert here brief description of the task]	
	D.1.2.1	*[Insert here the title of Deliverable and state the objective it is linked to – cfr 3.a. List of project objectives]*
	D.1.2.2	
	D.1.2.3	
T.1.3	*[Insert here title of the task]*	
	[Insert here task leader's institution]	
	[Insert here brief description of the task]	
	D.1.3.1	*[Insert here the title of Deliverable and state the objective it is linked to – cfr 3.a. List of project objectives]*
	D.1.3.2	
	D.1.3.3	

8. Risk management

8.a. Risk management description

Complete the table matching the risk to the task. E.g. if the risk is associated to task 2.1, number the risk R.2.1. Add as many lines as needed to cover the risks that could delay or hinder the project.

Risk	Name of the Risk	Contingency Plan
R.X.X.	*[Insert here name of the risk]*	*[Insert here contingency plan for the risk]*
R.X.X.		
R.X.X.		
R.X.X.		

This section does not require an evaluation.

8.b. Likelihood and importance of the risk						8.b. Likelihood and importance of the risk
Locate the risks, in terms of its likelihood of occurrence and impact on the project, on the table by transferring the numbers (R.X.X).						Assess the implementation risk management and contingency plans.

	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Significant	Severe
Very likely					
Likely					
Possible					
Unlikely					
Very unlikely					

9. Data Management Plan

9.a. Data summary

Provide information regarding the data that will be used in the project.	Is the description of data and metadata adequate and sufficient?
- Type(s) of data that will be used in the project (experimental, observational, images, text…) - Estimated size of the data. - Collection and or/ re-use of existing data. - Origins of the data (source of collected and/or re-used datasets). (1/2 page).	Has the acquisition, production, and (re)use of data been adequately addressed? Do data and metadata comply with current standards?

9.b. Open and FAIR compliance

Provide information on the Open and FAIR management of data.	Do the data & data management comply with FAIR principles?
- List of identifiers or repositories that will be used. - Information on Open Access, as well as access provisions and IPR arrangement where relevant - Provide information on standards, formats and vocabularies for data and metadata that will be used to make data interoperable. - Licensing for data sharing and tools/software/models for data generation and validation/interpretation/re-use to ensure the re-usability of the data. (1/2 page).	Have the legal issues/aspects of the data been adequately and sufficiently addressed?

9.c. Curation, storage and preservation costs	9.c. Curation, storage and preservation costs
Provide information regarding the curation, storage and preservation costs of data, during and after the project. • The person/entity/team that will be responsible for data management and quality assurance. • The estimated costs for curation and storage. (1/2 page).	Is the data storage and back-up adequately and sufficiently described? Are the measures foreseen by the team to curate, store and enable reuse of the data according to FAIR principles satisfactory?

10. Coordinator / Partnership

10.a. Coordinator (C=P1)	10.a. Coordinator (C=P1)
Provide a short description of expertise and skills of the coordinator: • Name & Surname, Gender, Service/Department, Institution, Link to Gender Equality Plan of Institution (if there is any), Number of years active in research, Number of years of management experience. • Their professional background and relevant experience in relation to the project, including managerial experience. • Max. top 5 achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project • A list of projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project (indicate duration, funding source and role) • If possible, include web links for all the information above.	Assess the scientific quality and expertise of the coordinator within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be considered.
10.b. Funded partners	**10.b. Funded partners**
Provide a short description of expertise and skills of each partner: • Name & Surname, Gender, Service/Department, Institution, Link to Gender Equality Plan of Institution (if there is any), Number of years active in research • Their professional background and relevant experience in relation to the project • Max. top 5 achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project • A list of the research projects carried out over the past five years in the field under consideration or related areas (specify the duration of the work and funding source). • A list of projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project (indicate duration, funding source and role) • If possible, include web links for all the information above.	Assess the scientific quality and expertise of the individual partners within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be considered.

10.c. Non-funded partners	10.c. Non-funded partners
To be included as non-funded partner, the non-funded partner must provide a substantial contribution to the research project appearing in the Work Plan (performing tasks). Federal departments are excluded. Provide a short description of each non-funded partner: • Name, surname, Gender, Institution, Service/Department • Professional background relevant to the project • Description of the aspect(s) of the project of interest and motivation why • Description of the contribution to the project (in-kind and/or in-cash)	Assess the scientific quality and expertise of each non-funded partner individually within the frame of the project.
10.d. Combined expertise of the consortium (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners)	**10.d. Combined expertise of the consortium (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners)**
Describe how all project partners will provide the scientific expertise needed for the project, and the added value associated to addressing the research topic as a network of researchers (1 page).	Evaluate the adequacy of the partnership as reasoned by the applicants in terms of scientific expertise needed and added value associated to addressing the research topic as a network of researchers.
11.e. Gender balance in the project team	
Describe to what extent the project team of funded partners is diverse in terms of gender, and possible pathways to improve gender balance if it has not been yet achieved. Describe how the project will ensure that all gender groups can provide input, can access and can participate in project activities, as well as the mechanisms in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects (1/2 page).	Assess the gender aspects and/or issues in the research team(s) and (if applicable) the network.

11. Budget	
Please consult the BUDGET RULES file on the S4Policy website. Fill in the **budget table**.	Is the budget realistic, well-balanced among partners (if applicable), and in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project? **Note**: The online submission platform automatically checks the specific rules for the budget repartition in terms of staff, operating costs, overheads, equipment, subcontracting and international research partners – thus, there is no need to check the compliance with the budget rules.

SECTION C: OUTREACH AND DISSEMINATION

12. Dissemination

12.a. Dissemination plan

Classify all the deliverables (cfr. list and numbering in 7.b.) in terms of category of deliverable and targeted group and provide the foreseen dissemination period.	This section does not require an evaluation.

Deliverable	Category of deliverable	Targeted group	Dissemination period
D.X.X. Title	*[From a list]*	*[From a list, multiple choice allowed]*	
D.X.X. Title			
D.X.X. Title			

12.b. Description of dissemination plan

Describe, for each targeted group, how and in what form the dissemination is to be accomplished (1 page).	Assess the capacity of the research team to: - Promote the results and acquired knowledge - Enable (peer-reviewed) publication to the academic community and broader public - Enable access to and use of data Furthermore, assess the accuracy of selected targeted audiences, the appropriateness of communication tools and approaches, etc.

13. Stakeholder committee

13.a. List of potential Stakeholder committee members

List the potential members of the Stakeholder committee and their role. - Specify the functioning and role (informed, consulted, involved in research) of the follow-up committee - Provide a motivated list of possible committee members with their role and profiles. - Describe the gender balance in the composition of the committee **Note**: - Each project is accompanied by a follow-up committee. The objective of this committee is to provide an active follow-up of the project and to assist in the valorisation of the research, via exchange and provision of data and information, giving advice, suggesting means of valorisation, etc. - The follow-up committee is composed of potential users of the results, such as representatives of public authorities at national, regional, European, or international level, social actors, scientists, industrial actors, etc. - The members of the follow-up committee are non-funded.	Assess the coherence of the composition of the follow-up committee, its proposed role (informed, consulted, involved) and functioning (number of meetings, method of information exchange, etc.) with the foreseen impact of the project. Evaluate the involvement of non-scientific stakeholders in the early stages of the project (co-creation of results) – where appropriate. Take into account gender balance. **Note**: Bear in mind that the set-up of a follow-up committee composed of possible users of the project results is compulsory.

• The final composition of the follow-up committee will be defined in collaboration with BELSPO.	
13.b. Way of working	
Describe the way of working of the Stakeholder Committee (1 page).	Assess the way of working of the Stakeholder Committee.

FULL PROPOSALS: EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PANEL EVALUATORS

These guidelines describe the criteria for the evaluation of project proposals at the stage of the PANEL.

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE PRIOR TO THE PANEL MEETING	DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE DURING THE PANEL MEETING
- Information File - Evaluation guidelines (this document) - Budget Rules - Scientific ranking of the proposals (from the marks given by individual evaluators) - Submitted project proposals (remotely evaluated), including: - General information - Scientific information (scope, state of the art, research objectives, methodology, research ethics form, gender dimension) - Implementation of the proposal (Gantt chart, work plan description, risk management, Data Management Plan, Coordinator/Partnership, budget table) - Outreach and dissemination (dissemination and stakeholder committee).	- Proposals and pre-drafted consensus reports - Proposal ranking from which to elaborate the funding scenario (spread sheets) - Document (template) to explain the funding scenario(s) proposed during the Panel meeting - Any other type of information provided by BELSPO that would help the evaluation Panel to develop (a) funding scenario(s)

PANEL EVALUATION CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR CO-FUNDED PROPOSALS

The funding scenario(s) produced during the Panel meeting must be accompanied by a document explaining the choices made in terms of the following criteria and the suggestions/recommendations made by the remote evaluators within the consensus report.

Available Call budget

Project budget versus Call budget

Coverage in terms of the scope of the Call

Coverage in terms of the scope of the research priorities

Coverage in terms of participation

Coverage in terms of institutions

Critical mass

Coverage in terms of synergy compared to previous financed subjects within the frame of S4Policy (Policy-driven)

Adjustments, recommendations

- Adjustments/recommendations in term of follow-up committee, workplan, …
- Adjustments of budget (either suggested by the remote evaluators or in view of the ensemble of proposals)