**P4olicy Science**

**belspo**

## FULL PROPOSALS (P4SCIENCE): 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** <br> • **The different sections can be found as online fields within the online platform** <br> • **Texts must be comprehensive, to the point, and focused on the specific criteria** <br> • **Note that depending on the chosen toolbox category not all fields are required to be filled in. Please refer to the full proposal template.** | • **Evaluators are required to mark the specified criteria** <br> • **Specific comments must be provided for each selection criteria** <br> • **The comments must be comprehensive, to the point and focused on specific positive and/or negative aspects explaining/justifying the attributed appreciation** <br> • **The comments must avoid summarising the proposal's content** |

### 1. Project information & summary

| | |
|---|---|
| **Toolbox category and tool(s)** <br> **Title of the proposal** <br> **Acronym of the proposal** <br> **Duration of the project (In months).** <br> **Budget** <br> **Contribution to SDG goals** <br> **Type of directionality** <br> **Contribution to Open Access and Open Data** <br> **Integrity in the conduct of research** <br><br> **Proposal summary (3999 char.).** <br><br> **Keywords (6)** | This section does not require an evaluation. |

## SECTION A: SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

| 2. Scope | 2. Scope |
|---|---|
| **N/A** | |

| 3. State of the art | 3. State of the art |
|---|---|
| **3.a. State of the art** | **3.a. State of the art** |
| Describe the state of current knowledge at national and international level on the topic of the project (1500 char.). | Please assess if the state of the art indicates (1) good knowledge and understanding of the state of the art of all the relevant research areas and disciplines, and (2) if it includes a sufficiently broad overview of the relevant scientific perspectives within each of the research areas/disciplines. Please provide reasoning for your assessment in the comments section |
| **3.b. Bibliographic references** | **3.b. Bibliographic references** |
| List the list of relevant publications mentioned in point 2.a. State of the Art (1500 char.). | This section does not require an evaluation. |

| 4. Project Objectives | 4. Project Objectives |
|---|---|
| **4.1. List of project objectives** | **4.1. List of project objectives** |
| Briefly list the objectives of the project.<br><br>Objective A<br>Objective B<br>Objective C<br>... | This section does not require an evaluation.<br><br>*Sections 4.1. List of project objectives and 4.2 Description of the objectives are evaluated together.* |
| **4.2. Description of the objectives** | **4.2. Description of the objectives** |
| Elaborate on your list of objectives, including how the objectives of the project relate to the scientific request(s) in the original call proposal and state of the art (current knowledge at national and international level on the topic) (3999 char.). | Sections 4.1. List of project objectives and 4.2 Description of the objectives are evaluated together.<br><br>Please assess the quality, coherency and feasibility of the (list of) research objectives. Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments.<br><ul><li>*Are the research objectives well-developed, clear and coherent?*</li><li>*Are these objectives feasible within the duration and the budget of the project?*</li><li>*Does the selection of research objectives reflect the original call proposal adequately, and cover the full scope of the proposal?*</li><li>*Will these objectives enable the accomplishment of the project's outcome?*</li></ul> |

| 5. Methodology | 5. 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) (36 000 char.). | Please evaluate the approach undertaken. Elaborate on your reasoning in the comments.<br><br>• *Is the methodology transparent, described clearly and sufficiently extensive?*<br>• *Does the chosen methodology cover all relevant aspects of the scientific requests, scope of the proposal and list of objectives?*<br>• *Are the expected outcomes of the project achievable by means of the methodology presented?*<br><br>**Note:** not all projects need to be original or innovative, but the approach undertaken must be within scope and adequately explained. E.g. A non-original project can be deemed 'excellent' even if it is not innovative, provided there is adequate argumentation, as not all project calls request novel or innovative research. |

| 6. Ethics & Gender | 6. Ethics & Gender |
|---|---|
| **6.1 Research ethics** | **6.1 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. | Please assess the awareness of ethical issues of the project, and how the project will handle the identified issues. Please refer to both the table and the additional comments provided by the applicant. Elaborate your reasoning in the comments, and if the proposal is deemed below 'Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements.<br><br>Please refer to Belgian Code of Conduct for more information. You can find this document on our website. |

| 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 (3999 char.).

| 6.2. Gender dimension in the research | 6.2. 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 (3999 char.). | Please use the Gender Checklist to assess how the project considers aspects and/or issues related to gender in the proposed research. <br><br> • *If the research involves humans as research objects, has the relevance of gender to the research topic been analysed?* <br> • *Does the methodology ensure that (possible) gender differences will be investigated; that sex/gender differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research project?* <br> • *Does the proposal explicitly and comprehensively explain how gender issues will be handled?* <br> • *Have possibly differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research on women and men been considered?* <br> • *Are questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, etc. designed to unravel potentially relevant sex and/or gender differences in your data?* |

| | • *Are the groups involved in the project (e.g. samples, testing groups) gender-balanced? and is data analysed according to the sex variable?* |
|---|---|

## SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL

| **7. Workpackages** | **7. Workpackages** |
|---|---|
| **7.x. Workpackage x** | **7.x. Workpackage x** |
| Describe the work plan of the project in Work Packages, Tasks and Deliverables, assigning one leading institution for each Task.<br>Number them using the following system:<br><br>WP1      For Work Package 1<br>T.1.1      For Task 1 in Work Package 1<br>D.1.1.1      For Deliverable 1 in Work Package 1, Task 1.<br>D.1.1.2      For Deliverable 2 in Work Package 1, Task 2.<br><br>Write up to 10 Work Packages, and a max. of 10 Tasks for each Work Package. Link the Deliverables to the list of objectives in section 4.<br>Remember that depending on the toolbox category, WP Coordination, WP Data Management and WP Valorisation (of deliverables), are compulsory. Please remember that a comprehensive DMP must be provided as a Deliverable within the 6 first months of the starting date of the R&D project. | Assess how the work planning is broken down in Work Packages, Tasks and Deliverables, and if and how it will enable the realisation of the project:<br><br>• *Are the WP's, tasks, and deliverables coherent with the objectives, methodology and expected results of the project?*<br>• *Does the description of the work plan correspond to the Gantt chart?*<br><br>Please provide an overall assessment of the requested level of person-power of each partner throughout the work packages and tasks and suggest recommendations regarding the intensity of their activities and the importance of their contributions to each task within the WP and project.<br><br>**Note**: The WP dissemination is not evaluated here, but later in Point 15. |

| **8. Gantt chart & Risk management** | **8. Gantt chart & Risk management** |
|---|---|
| **8.1. Risk management description** | **8.1. 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. | Please evaluate the risk assessment and assess the quality of the contingency plans provided, if they correspond to the risk assessment and are tested accordingly.<br><br>This section does not require an evaluation. |

| Risk Number | Name of the Risk | Contingency Plan | Likelihood of the risk | Importance of the risk |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| R.X.X | | | ☐ Very unlikely<br>☐ Unlikely<br>☐ Possible<br>☐ Likely<br>☐ Very Likely | ☐ Negligible<br>☐ Minor<br>☐ Moderate<br>☐ Significant<br>☐ Severe |

| **8.2. Gantt chart** | **8.2. Gantt chart** |
|---|---|
| Please upload to the Platform the GANTT CHART template. Complete BELSPO's **GANTT chart (separate file available on the website)** in accordance with the description of the detailed work plan, tasks and deliverables above: | Please refer to the description of the proposal and Gantt chart (separate file). |

- Work intensity of each partner within each task (expressed in person-month [PM])
- Include for each partner the person-months funded by the P4Science 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 P4Science project (BELSPO), the 7th month must be included under 'Person-months other sources' instead of 'Person-months BELSPO'.
- Compulsory work packages, depending on toolbox category:
  - Coordination, project management and reporting
  - Data management
  - Dissemination

Provide an overall assessment of the work planning (time schedule, duration and person-power per task per month), in relation to the feasibility of completing the project. During this assessment, please assess the efficiency, timing, and synergy between tasks, and if the tasks within the WP's are well-integrated and coherent.

Secondly, please assess the distribution of Tasks in the WP **among partners**, in function of their expertise and role in the project (it is not necessary to go into detail on what each partner does) and in function of the allocated time of person-power per task per partner.

If the proposal is deemed 'Medium Quality', 'Good Quality or 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements in the comments. Please add recommendations regarding the duration and pertinence of the tasks in the comments.

## 9. Data Management Plan

### 9.1. Data summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Provide information regarding the data that will be used in the project.<br>• Type(s) of data that will be used in the project (experimental, observational, images, text…)<br>• Estimated size of the data.<br>• Collection and or/ re-use of existing data.<br>• Origins of the data (source of collected and/or re-used datasets).<br><br>(3999 char.). | Sections 9.1. Data Summary, 9.2. Open and FAIR compliance and 9.3. Curation storage and preservation costs are evaluated together. |

### 9.2. Open and FAIR compliance

| | |
|---|---|
| Provide information on the Open and FAIR management of data.<br>• List of identifiers or repositories that will be used.<br>• Information on Open Access, as well as access provisions and IPR arrangement where relevant<br>• Provide information on standards, formats and vocabularies for data and metadata that will be used to make data interoperable.<br>• Licensing for data sharing and tools/software/models for data generation and validation/interpretation/re-use to ensure the re-usability of the data.<br><br>(3999 char.). | Sections 9.1. Data Summary, 9.2. Open and FAIR compliance and 9.3. Curation storage and preservation costs are evaluated together. |

### 9.3. Curation, storage and preservation costs

| | |
|---|---|
| Provide information regarding the curation, storage and preservation costs of data, during and after the project. | **Sections 9.1. Data Summary, 9.2. Open and FAIR compliance and 9.3. Curation storage and preservation costs are evaluated together.** |

| | |
|---|---|
| • The person/entity/team that will be responsible for data management and quality assurance.<br>• The estimated costs for curation and storage.<br><br>(3999 char.). | Please assess if all requested information is accurately described in the proposal, if there are any shortcomings and the quality of the provided information on data description, FAIR compliance and curation. Please elaborate your choice in the comments. If the proposal is deemed 'Good Quality or 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements and recommendation in the comments.<br><br>Summary<br>• *Is the description of data and metadata adequate and sufficient?*<br>• *Has the acquisition, production, and (re)use of data been adequately addressed?*<br>• *Do data and metadata comply with current standards?*<br><br>Open and FAIR compliance<br>• *Do the data & data management comply with FAIR principles?*<br>• *Is provided Information on Open Access, as well as access provisions and IPR arrangement where relevant, adequately described?*<br>• *Have the legal issues/aspects of the data been adequately and sufficiently addressed?*<br><br>Curation, storage and preservation costs<br>• *Is the data storage and back-up adequately and sufficiently described?*<br>• *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. Coordinator / Partnership |
|---|---|
| **10.1 Coordinator (C=P1)** | **10.a. Coordinator (C=P1)** |
| Provide a short description of expertise and skills of the coordinator:<br>• 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.<br>• Their professional background and relevant experience in relation to the project, including managerial experience.<br>• If possible, include web links for all the information above. | Sections 10.1., 10.2. and 10.3. are evaluated together. |
| **10.2 Max. 5 top achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project** | **10.2 Max. 5 top achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project** |
| Provide max. top 5 achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project | Sections 10.1., 10.2. and 10.3. are evaluated together. |
| **10.3 Projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project** | **10.3 Projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project** |

| | |
|---|---|
| Provide a list of projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project (indicate duration, funding source and role) | Sections 10.1., 10.2. and 10.3. are evaluated together.

Please assess the compatibility of the coordinator's (and their team's) expertise with the project and their role (as coordinator). Elaborate your reasoning in the comments. If the proposal is deemed below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements.

*Please consider guiding questions:*
• *Is the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the coordinator a good match for the project? Does the coordinator have sufficient experience as a manager to coordinate the project?* |

| 11. Funded partner (if applicable) | 11. Funded partner (if applicable) |
|---|---|
| **11.x Funded partner x** | **11.x Funded partner x** |
| **11.x.1 Partner's Information** | **11.x.1 Partner's Information** |
| This section cannot be edited on the Platform. It appears in grey. It is just displayed to remind you of the Funded Partners you need to include in your Full Proposal. | This section does not require an evaluation |
| **11.x.2 Funded Partner** | **11.x.2 Funded Partner** |
| Provide a short description of expertise and skills of the coordinator:<br>• Name & Surname, Gender, Service/Department, Institution, Link to Gender Equality Plan of Institution (if there is any), Number of years active in research.<br>• Their professional background and relevant experience in relation to the project, including managerial experience.<br>• If possible, include web links for all the information above. | Sections 11.x.2., 11.x.3. and 11.x.4. are evaluated together. |
| **11.x.3 Max. 5 top achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project** | **11.x.3 Max. 5 top achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project** |
| Provide max. top 5 achievements, milestones or (peer-reviewed) publications related to the project | Sections 11.x.2., 11.x.3. and 11.x.4. are evaluated together. |
| **11.x.4 Projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project** | **11.x.4 Projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project** |
| Provide a list of projects carried out over the past 5 years in fields related to the project (indicate duration, funding source and role) | Sections 11.x.2., 11.x.3. and 11.x.4. are evaluated together.

Please assess the quality of the individual funded partners within the frame of the project.

Please consider guiding questions:
• *If the project has multiple partners: Is the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the partner a good match for the project?* |

| 12. Non-funded partners (if applicable) | 12. Non-funded partners (if applicable) |
|---|---|
| **12.x Non funded partner** | **12.x Non funded partner** |
| BELSPO understands by NON-FUNDED PARTNER, the institution participating on the project without receiving funds from BELSPO for its implementation. The NON-FUNDED PARTNER may contribute to the project in kind or with cash. BELSPO understands by PROMOTOR, the researcher (person) that will implement the project in the name of their institution.<br><br>In order to be included as NON-FUNDED PARTNER the institution must NOT receive any funds within the project, and must provide a substantial contribution to it, appearing in the Work Plan (performing tasks). Federal Departments and/or organisations in their capacity of service provides to the federal government are excluded. The contribution of the IPF or RBINS in their respective role as operator of the station or the RV Belgica is not considered a partner contribution.<br><br>Provide a short description of each non-funded partner:<br>• Name, surname, Gender, Institution, Service/Department<br>• Professional background relevant to the project<br>• Description of the aspect(s) of the project of interest and motivation why<br>• Description of the contribution to the project (in-kind and/or in-cash) | Please assess the quality of the individual non-funded partners within the frame of the project.<br><br>Please consider guiding questions:<br>• *If the project has multiple partners: Is the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the partner a good match for the project?* |

| 13. Partnership | 13. Partnership |
|---|---|
| **13.1. Combined expertise of the consortium (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners) (if applicable)** | **13.1. Combined expertise of the consortium (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners) (if applicable)** |
| 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 (3999 char.). | Please evaluate the adequacy (including expertise, experience and role) of the partnership among the coordinators and the (non-funded) partners, and its (additional) benefits to the research and research project overall. Guiding questions:<br>• *Does the experience of all partners (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners) cover the full scope of the research project to reach the objectives?*<br>• *Are all network opportunities explored?* |
| **13.2. Gender balance in the project team (if applicable)** | **13.2. Gender balance in the project team (if applicable)** |
| 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 (3999 char.). | Assess the gender aspects and/or issues in the research team(s) and (if applicable) the network. Please take the following guiding questions into consideration during your evaluation:<br><br>• *Is the research team diverse and balanced in terms of gender?*<br>• *Does the proposal include ways to improve the gender balance, if it has not yet been achieved?*<br>• *Does the proposal adequately describe how the project will ensure that all gender groups within the research team can fairly and equally contribute to the project as foreseen in the workplan and on their level of expertise, and can access and participate in project activities.* |

| | • *How does the proposal suggest putting mechanisms in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects?* |
|---|---|

| 14. Budget | 14. Budget |
|---|---|
| **Please consult the BUDGET RULES file on the P4Science call website.**<br><br>The budget of the project proposal is entered on the Platform, but first, the Coordinator must complete the Budget Table (template provided on the P4Science website) both for themselves and their Funded Partners (if applicable). The Budget Table will be uploaded to the Platform.  The reason for this is that the Platform does not check the compliance of the entered values with the budget rules. | Please consider if the budget is realistic, well-balanced among funded- partners (if applicable) and proportionate to their contribution, and if it is in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project? Please elaborate your choice in the comments. |

## SECTION C: OUTREACH AND DISSEMINATION

| 15. Dissemination | 15. Dissemination |
|---|---|
| **15.1. Dissemination plan** | **15.1. 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 number | Deliverable title | Type of deliverable<br>*(choose one, the same as in section 7. Work Packages)* | Targeted group<br>*(choose a max. of 3)* | Dissemination period<br>*(month)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| D.X.X.X | | ☐ Collections<br>☐ Event<br>☐ Knowledge organisation tool<br>☐ Maps and models<br>☐ Media<br>☐ Paper<br>☐ Participation in event<br>☐ Report<br>☐ Strategic and decision tools<br>☐ Studies & results<br>☐ Technical IT tools<br>☐ Instruction and documentation tools<br>☐ Other | ☐ Educators and students<br>☐ General Public<br>☐ Government and policy makers<br>☐ Indigenous Groups and Local Communities<br>☐ International Organisations<br>☐ Media and Public Outreach<br>☐ NGOs and Civil Society Organisations<br>☐ Other professionals from private sector<br>☐ Other professionals from public organisations<br>☐ Regulatory and Standard Bodies<br>☐ Researchers from private sector<br>☐ Researchers from public organisations | |

| **15.2. Description of dissemination plan** | **15.2. Description of dissemination plan** |
|---|---|
| Describe, for each targeted group, how and in what form the dissemination is to be accomplished (3999 car.). | Sections '15.1. Dissemination plan' and '15.2. Description of dissemination plan' are evaluated together.<br><br>Please assess the capacity of the research team to:<br><br>• Promote the results and acquired knowledge<br>• 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.<br><br>Please elaborate your choice in the comments. |

| 16. Stakeholder committee | 16. Stakeholder committee |
|---|---|
| **16.1. List of potential Stakeholder committee members** | **16.1. List of potential Stakeholder committee members** |
| List the potential members of the Stakeholder committee and their role.<br>• Specify the functioning and role (informed, consulted, involved in research) of the follow-up committee<br>• Provide a motivated list of possible committee members with their role and profiles.<br>• Describe the gender balance in the composition of the committee<br><br>**Note**:<br>• Only R&D projects are accompanied by stakeholder committee.<br>• 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.<br>• The stakeholder 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.<br>• The members of the stakeholder committee are non-funded.<br>• The final composition of the stakeholder committee will be defined in collaboration with BELSPO. | This section does not require an evaluation. |
| **16.2. Way of working** | **16.2. Way of working** |
| Describe the way of working of the Stakeholder Committee (3600 char.). | Sections 16.1. List of potential Stakeholder committee members and 16.2. Way of working are evaluated together. Please assess the following aspects and elaborate your reasoning in the comments:<br><br>• *The coherence of the composition of the follow-up committee*<br>• *The proposed role for the members (informed, consulted, involved)*<br>• *To the way of working (number of meetings, method of information exchange, etc.), in relation to the foreseen outcome of the project.*<br>• *The involvement of non-scientific stakeholders in the early stages of the project (co-creation of results) – where appropriate. Take into account gender balance.*<br><br>Note: It is compulsory that the stakeholder committee includes members that are potentially end-users of the results of project. |

**SECTION D: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

| 17.  Strengths and weaknesses | |
|---|---|
| This section is only available to the  evaluator | Please list the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Use bullet points and short sentences. |

| 18. Recommendations for improvement for the applicants | |
|---|---|
| This section is only available to the evaluator. | Please provide recommendations for the researchers to improve their project. |

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

## 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 research topics**

Coverage in terms of the research topics of the projects

**Adjustments, recommendations**

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