



New RV Belgica EVALUATION MATRIX



2. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SCOPE OF THE CALL :

	OUT of scope	Partially OUT of scope	IN scope
a. IN / OUT of scope evaluation	The proposal fails to comply with the objectives of the call	For part of the project the link to the objectives of the call is loose or artificial.	The proposal fully complies with the objectives of the call

3. SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

		Poor - Insufficient Information (1)	Reasonable - Good Quality (2)	High Quality (3)	Very High Quality (4)	Exceptional (5)
3.1 Objectives and state of the art	a. Research objectives Are the research objectives clear and coherent?	The research objectives are badly defined OR do not align with each other	The research objectives are mostly clear and sufficiently aligned	The research objectives are clear and align with each other	The research objectives are very well described with a nearly perfect alignment	The research objectives are fully and exceptionally well described with an outstanding alignment
	b. Knowledge of the state of the art Does the proposal provide an accurate overview of the state of the art?	The proposal has important flaws regarding the state of the art	The proposal demonstrates an average knowledge of the state of the art in the domain, without critical omissions	The proposal shows a good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are minimal	The proposal shows a very good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are superfluous	The proposal shows an exhaustive knowledge of the state of the art in the domain
	c. Position of the project with respect to the state of the art How is the project positioned in relation to the state of the art?	The project does not provide any added value with respect to the state of the art	The project will provide a reasonable added value to the state of the art	The project will provide a substantial added value to the state of the art	The project is original and will contribute significantly to the state of the art	The project is very original and of potential groundbreaking nature
	d. Scientific risk of the project in relation to the objectives How well are the scientific risks evaluated by the applicants? Do they provide an adequate 'fall-back' plan, if needed?	The proposal overlooks the main potential risks and does not provide an adequate 'fall back' plan	The proposal identifies the main potential risks, providing a correct 'fall back' plan	The proposal includes a good identification of the potential risks and adequate, feasible 'fall back' options	The proposal includes a very good identification of the potential risks and very well designed 'fall back' options	The proposal includes a thorough identification of the potential risks and perfectly designed 'fall back' options
3.2 Coherence between research objectives and methodology	a. Methodological approach Evaluate the approach undertaken. Not all projects need to be original or innovative, but the approach undertaken must be adequately explained.	The approach is underdeveloped and/or poorly argued, it does not provide pathways to the state of research objectives	The approach to the topic is acceptable, and provides reasonable pathways to the stated objectives	The approach is more than appropriate and provides adequate pathways to realise the objectives	The project ensures very good pathways to realise the objectives, with a novel approach	The project ensures outstanding pathways to realise the objectives, and the approach is ground-breaking and forward looking
	b. Methodology Assess the chosen methodology (taking into account the different disciplines mobilised) and the articulation of the objectives-methodology-expected outcomes.	The methodology and use of data have shortcomings and/or lacks details.	The methodology and use of data are sufficient. The objectives, methodology and expected outcomes form a coherent and reasonable unit, but contain some gaps or shortcomings	The methodology and use of data are elaborate, well matched to the objectives and expected outcomes. There is room for minor improvement	The methodology and use of data are very good and it ensures a sound match to the objectives and outcomes, and leaves little room for improvement	The methodology and use of data are outstanding and it ensures a perfect match to the objectives and outcomes, and leaves no room for improvement
	c. Gender Assess the gender aspects and/or issues in the proposed research	Gender is not considered in the content of the project. There are serious gaps or shortcomings.	Gender is sufficiently considered in the content of the project but contains some gaps or shortcomings.	Gender is adequately considered in the content of the project. There is room for minor improvement.	Gender is very well considered in the content of the project. leaves little room for improvement.	Gender is perfectly and seriously considered in the content of the project. It leaves no room for improvement
	d. Ethical Assess the awareness of ethical issues of the project and ways to deal with these using appropriate channels.	The evaluation of ethical issues has shortcomings and/or lacks details.	The proposal includes a sufficient evaluation of ethical issues and ways to deal with these - if any.	The proposal includes a good evaluation of ethical issues and ways to deal with these are thought through - if any.	The proposal includes a very good evaluation of ethical issues and ways to deal with these are very well thought through - if any.	The proposal includes an exhaustive evaluation of ethical issues and carefully designed ways to deal with these - if any.

4. QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

		Poor - Insufficient Information (1)	Reasonable - Good Quality (2)	High Quality (3)	Very High Quality (4)	Exceptional (5)
4.1 Single team project expertise	<p>Only if applicable Assess the scientific quality and expertise of the promotor within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management should be taken into account, including management, synthesis and communication skills.</p>	The partner is poorly equipped for the proposed research due to insufficient experience and expertise	The partner possess reasonable experience and expertise to perform the research in a suitable manner	The partner is a well known expert in her/his field, who can perform the research in a sound manner	The partner is an acknowledged expert in her/his field, who can perform the research competently	The partner is pioneer or an established authority in her/his field, whose involvement will elevate the value of the outcome
4.1 Network expertise	<p>a. Individual quality of the partners – only if applicable Assess the quality of the individual partners within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be taken into account, including management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator.</p>	The partners are poorly equipped for the proposed research due to insufficient experience and expertise	The partners possess reasonable experience and expertise to perform the research in a suitable manner	The partners are well known experts in their fields, who can perform the research in a sound manner	The partners are acknowledged experts in their fields, who can perform the research competently	The partners are pioneers or established authorities in their field, whose involvement will elevate the value of the outcome
	<p>b. Adequacy and added value of the proposed partnership in addressing the topic – only if applicable This part evaluates the adequacy of the partnership as reasoned by the applicants in relation to the project objectives, including gender aspects and/or issues.</p>	The partnership has not taken into account essential network dimensions, hindering the realization of the project	The partnership is sufficiently balanced, for the project to be feasible	The partnership is well balanced in terms of the different dimensions, bringing an added value to the proposal	The partnership is very well balanced in terms of the different dimensions, bringing a high added value to the proposal	The partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of all the different dimensions, bringing the highest added value to the proposal
4.2 Gender	<p>Gender Assess the gender aspects and/or issues in the proposal research team(s) and (if applicable) the network.</p>	The research team/partnership is not balanced in terms of gender. No mechanisms are put in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects.	The research team/partnership is sufficiently balanced in terms of gender. Standard mechanisms are put in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects.	The research team/partnership is well balanced in terms of gender. Adequate mechanisms are put in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects.	The research team/partnership is very well balanced in terms of gender. Sound mechanisms are put in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects.	The research team/partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of gender. Perfectly elaborated mechanisms are put in place to manage and monitor gender equality aspects.
4.3 Adequacy of the work plan	<p>a. Relation of the work packages to the proposal theme(s) and aim(s) 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 realisation of the project.</p>	The work plan raises doubts on the successful implementation of several aspects of the project	The work plan sufficiently enables to apprehend the objectives of the project, leaving room for improvement (shortcomings and/or redundancies)	The work plan correctly enables to apprehend the objectives of the project leaving room for improvement (small shortcomings and/or redundancies)	The work plan enables very well to apprehend the objectives of the project leaving some room for few improvements (minor shortcomings and/or redundancies)	The work plan outstandingly enables to apprehend all the objectives of the project with neither redundancies nor shortcomings
	<p>b. Work planning: GANTT chart (→consult the GANTT chart, filled out by the applicants) Is the work planning (time schedule, duration and person-power effort per task) appropriate and feasible to run the project? (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).</p>	The work planning is not sufficiently adequate or sufficiently elaborated. Structural improvements are needed	The work planning is elaborated in a reasonable way, but contains some gaps or shortcomings and leaves room for improvement	The work planning is elaborated in a well-thought manner, allowing for minor improvements regarding efficiency, integration and synergy within the tasks	The work planning is elaborated in an efficient and cost effective way, however allowing for few minor improvements regarding efficiency, integration and synergy within the tasks	The work planning is elaborated in an extremely efficient and cost effective way, clearly focused on reaching a high level of integration and synergy within the tasks
	<p>c. Implementation risk management Assess the implementation risk management and contingency plans.</p>	Important risks are overlooked and/or contingency plans are not sufficiently realistic	Adequate assessment of the major risks and reasonable contingency plans	Good assessment of the risks and good preventive contingency plans	Exhaustive assessment of the risks and very good preventive contingency plans	Outstanding assessment of the risks and excellent preventive outline of solutions and alternatives
	<p>d. Workload intensity in relation to the work packages (→consult the GANTT chart, filled out by the applicants) 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).</p>	The work repartition among partners is not sufficiently justified by the tasks; the requested level of person-power calls for major adjustments	There is a reasonable work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power calls for some adjustments	There is an appropriate work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power may call for minor adjustments	There is a very good work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power may call for few minor adjustments	All partners have very fine-tuned, pertinent and cost-effective work efforts throughout work packages and tasks

<p>4.4 Data management plan</p>	<p>Data management plan and availability of generated data after the research is finalised Assess the quality of the data management plan and the availability of the generated data</p>	<p>The data management plan containing significant shortcomings or gaps</p>	<p>The data management plan follows basic standards in making the generated data available</p>	<p>The data management plan follows good standards, making the data easily available</p>	<p>The data management is very well worked out, following good standards, making the data easily available and re-usable</p>	<p>There is an excellent data management plan in line with the highest standards to enable easy re-use of the data</p>
---------------------------------	---	---	--	--	--	--

5. IMPACT

		Poor - Insufficient Information (1)	Reasonable - Good Quality (2)	High Quality (3)	Very High Quality (4)	Exceptional (5)
5.1 Potential impact of the project	Potential impact of the proposal in light of the expected outcomes Assess the potential impact as described in the proposal	The proposal fails to acknowledge the principal domains of impact and its significance	The proposal acknowledges the principal domains of impact and its significance	The proposal rightly evaluates the targeted impact and its significance	The proposal evaluates the targeted impact and its significance very well	The proposal outstandingly evaluates targeted impact and its significance
5.2 Follow-up committee	Follow-up committee 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.	The proposal marginally involves stakeholders without thorough substantiation of the committee's functioning	The follow-up committee members are sufficiently involved in the proposal in a way that will contribute to the realisation of the project. However improvements can be made in the composition or way of functioning	The proposal provides good and relevant interaction with pertinent and representative stakeholders that have a clear involvement. Minor improvements can be made in the composition or way of functioning	The proposal provides very good and relevant interaction with pertinent and representative stakeholders that have a clear involvement. Attempts are made to include non-scientific stakeholders where appropriate	The proposal depicts highly relevant, strong, dynamic interaction with stakeholders, including non-scientists, involving them in a highly synergetic manner (co-creation) from the early stages of the project
5.4 Valorisation plans	Plans to maximise the impact of the project (science and other...) Assess the capacity of promoting results and knowledge and enabling publication and exploitation of data; the adequacy of the targeted audiences, the appropriateness of communication tools and approaches, ...	The proposal outlines valorisation and disseminating strategies which contain significant gaps or shortcomings. No efforts are made to promote and distribute results	The valorisation plans are sufficiently described; they allow promoting results and enable publication. The appropriate communication tools and approaches are used, but activities are somewhat limited in terms of approaching different targets.	The valorisation plans are well described and offer a good variety in terms of dissemination activities for different targets, using sound but no original communication tools and approaches.	The valorisation plans are very well described and offer considerable variety in terms of dissemination activities for different targets, using original communication tools and approaches leading to a good transfer and/or utilisation of results	The valorisation plans are fully described and offer an original and ambitious strategy to captivate its targets and generate high interest about its results. There is ambition to co-create by-products for non-scientific actors based on its findings

6. BUDGET ASSESSMENT

6.1 Budget assessment	Budget assessment Is the budget realistic, well-balanced among partners (if applicable), and in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project?	The budget partially overestimates or underestimates fundamental needs of the project, and/or is not well aligned with its objectives and/or expected outcomes	The budget correctly estimates the fundamental needs of the project, leaving room for adjustments; it is adequately aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget correctly estimates all the needs of the project, however leaving room for small adjustments; it is well aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget is very well thought through and optimised. It correctly estimates all the needs of the project, leaving only room for minor adjustments; it is very well aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget is extremely well-thought and optimised. It perfectly estimates all the needs of the project and takes into account the post-project. It perfectly aligns with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	---	---