

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 • 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 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 • 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 proposal's content

1. General Information	1. General Information & Instructions
1.1. Project ID  This question applies to: All toolbox project types.  Completed fields: Some of the fields are already completed with information entered in the Expression of Interest. This question contains general information. All the information is automatically completed by the system except: • <u>Budget of the Proposal:</u> Mandatory. Please enter the total budget of the proposal excluding INCO budget. • <u>INCO budget:</u> Optional field, but must be entered if there is INCO budget. Please enter the budget related to INCO activities, if any.	1.1. Project ID A. Information regarding the Individual Evaluation Form Please enter the requested information in the form. B. Evaluation of question 1.1. Project ID This section does not require an evaluation. However, please check that the total budget of the proposal and the INCO budget of the proposal entered by the applicants in Question 1.1. Project ID of the Full Proposal corresponds to the totals provided in the Budget Table (separate file, part of the Full Proposal attachments). If these budgets are not the same, please signal it in Section 9. Budget of the Individual Evaluation form.

1.2. Project Classification ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns research priorities, strategic area of impact and toolbox categories. ✦ Completed fields: All the fields are already completed with information entered in the Expression of Interest, and they are not editable.	1.2. BELSPO Evaluation Procedure & Instructions A. Information regarding the Individual Evaluation Form The Individual Evaluation form explains here the evaluation procedure and provides instructions for evaluations. B. Evaluation of question 1.2. Project Classification (Full Proposal) This section does not require an evaluation. However, you must take note of how the project is classified, in order to assess the proposal; specially the research priority chosen (whether it corresponds with the topic of the proposal) and the type of project in relation to the toolbox (whether the tool chosen is adequate to implement the project proposal).
1.3. Funded & Non-Funded Partners ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the presence of Funded and Non-Funded Partners in your proposal. ✦ Completed fields: Some of the fields are already completed with information entered in the Expression of Interest. Though these may be editable, you are not allowed to modify them. <u>Funded Partners</u>: Do not change the selection. The choice made at the level of the Expression of Interest (Eol) appears here by default. You are <u>not allowed</u> to modify your choice, or add or delete Funded Partners entered in the Eol. <u>Non-Funded Partners</u>: Optional. Please indicate if your project has or does not have Non-Funded Partners. Note that by selecting that you have Non-Funded Partners, the section will be enabled and its completion will be mandatory.	1.3. Declarations A. Information regarding the Individual Evaluation Form The Individual Evaluation form provides here a number of declarations that you must accept in order to be able to submit your assignment. B. Evaluation of question 1.3. Funded & Non-Funded Partners (Full Proposal) This section does not require an evaluation. However, you must take note of the presence of Funded and/or Non-Funded Partners in the proposal. If any of these are present, you will have to evaluate them further in the form, in the corresponding sections.
1.4. Declarations ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This section consists of a number of declarations regarding the permission to submit, the respect of the Open Access Mandate and the Code of Ethics, and the use of Artificial Intelligence. All declarations are mandatory except for: <u>Artificial Intelligence</u>: Optional. This declaration has no impact in the outcome of the evaluation.	(Question does not exist on Individual Evaluation Form) A. Information regarding the Individual Evaluation Form The Individual Evaluation form does not have this question. B. Evaluation of question 1.3. Declarations (Full Proposal) This section does not require an evaluation. Please note that the mention of the use of artificial intelligence by the applicants must not be taken into account in the evaluation.
2. Proposal Summary	2. Proposal Summary
2.1. Proposal Summary	2.1. Proposal Summary

➡ **This question applies to: All toolbox project types.**

This section concerns the title, summary and keywords of your proposal.

✦ **Completed fields:** All the fields are already completed with information entered in the Expression of Interest.

Though the information is automatically completed by the system, you may edit:

- The title: Mandatory. Making sure that the acronym remains the same, and that you keep the acronym in the title: ACRONYM – Title of project.
- Summary: Mandatory. Note that the summary cannot diverge to the point that the expertise mobilised for the evaluation of the proposal will become irrelevant.

Please note that you cannot change the keywords.

A. Information regarding the Individual Evaluation Form

This is a non-editable question, just for your information.

B. Evaluation of question 2.1. Proposal Summary (Full Proposal)

This section does not require an evaluation.

(Question does not exist on Full Proposal Form)

3. Scope

This Section is not applicable in P4Science.

3. State of the Art	4. State of the Art & Project Objectives
3.1. Description of the State of the Art ➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox Level 1 category. This question concerns the State of the Art or your project proposal. <u>State of the Art</u>: Mandatory. Please describe the State of the Art in relation to your project; this is current knowledge at national and international level on the topic of the project. <u>Upload Fields</u>: Optional. You may add 2 images to illustrate the State of the Art. Note that there is space for bibliography in the next question.	4.1. State of the Art ➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: - R&D Project. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: 3.1. Description of the State of the Art 📄 Document to download: - Optional figures that the applicants may have submitted. - State of the Art: Check the Documents tab of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), for separate documents containing figures, titled: State of the art (name of file), with Comment Type 'Full Proposal attachments', and download them if present. Tasks - Please assess the state of the art in relation to the proposal and the research priorities chosen by the applicants. - Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. Guiding questions - Does the text indicate good knowledge and understanding of the state of the art in relation to the project and the research priorities selected by the applicants? - Is the state of the art up to date on the relevant research areas and disciplines present in the project? - Does the state of the art as described include a sufficiently broad overview of the relevant scientific perspectives within the chosen Research Priority & the research areas/disciplines?
3.2. Bibliographic References ➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox Level 1 category. This question concerns the Bibliographic References that support the State of the Art of your project. <u>Bibliographic References</u>: Optional. you may add the bibliographic references that support the State of the Art.	Evaluation of question 2.1. Proposal Summary (Full Proposal) This section does not require an evaluation.

4. Project Objectives	
4.1. Project Objectives	4.2. Project Objectives
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the objectives of the project. • <u>Project Objectives</u>: Mandatory. Please provide the list of objectives of the project. – Explain the objectives listed, in relation to the research priority and the toolbox category selected. – Additionally, if the toolbox category chosen is R&D Project, explain the objectives in relation to the state of the art (current knowledge at national and international level on the topic).	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All project types. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: – 4.1. Project Objectives Tasks • Please assess the quality, coherency and feasibility of the research objectives. • Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. Guiding questions • Are the research objectives well-developed, clear and coherent, covering the full scope of the proposal? • Are the research objectives coherent with the chosen project type from the Toolbox? • Are these objectives feasible within the duration and the budget of the project? • Will these objectives enable the accomplishment of the project's outcome?

5. Methodology	5. Methodology
5.1. Methodology	5.1. Methodology
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the methodology and workplan of the project. 📌 Dissemination: The dissemination aspect of the proposal must be included in this section for <u>Valorisation/Impact projects</u> (level 1 category). In the case of R&D Projects – the other toolbox level 1 category for which a dissemination plan is required, must be provided in Section 13. Dissemination Plan. • <u>Methodology:</u> Mandatory. Please provide a detailed description of the methodology. – Explain used methods, techniques, systems and/or way of working to achieve the foreseen results. – Describe the different disciplines mobilised. – Detail how your approach will enable to gather the expected results/deliverables. – Describe the workplan, naming and describing the work packages as in Section 6.1. Gantt Chart. – Please exclude the following aspects from this section: ▪ Overview of Data sources & Management → Appears in Section 7: Data Management Plan ▪ Gender dimension in the research → Appears Section 15: Gender ▪ Ethics & Research Security → Appears Section 16: Ethics & Research Security. • <u>Uploads:</u> Optional. You may upload up to 4 images to illustrate the methodology.	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All project types. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: – 5.1. Methodology – 5.2. INCO Activities 📄 Document to download: – Optional figures that the applicants may have submitted. – Methodology: Check the Documents tab of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), for separate documents containing figures, titled: Methodology (name of file), with Comment Type ‘Full Proposal attachments’, and download them if present. Tasks • Please evaluate the methodology proposed, the work plan and the INCO activities. • Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. Guiding questions <u>Methodology & work plan</u> • Are the methodology and the work plan clearly, and sufficiently described? • Do they cover all relevant aspects of the project? • Are designed in a way that will allow addressing the list of objectives? • Are they designed in a way that will make the expected outcomes achievable? <u>INCO activities - only if signalled by the applicants</u> • Are INCO activities in line with the objectives of the project? • Are they being adequate and clearly explained? • Do they provide added value to the project?
5.2. INCO activities	
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns INCO activities. • <u>Question regarding entering INCO budget in Section 1:</u> Mandatory. This is a redundant question to ensure that if you have INCO activities you have encoded the budget in Section 1. Please confirm that you have or have NOT entered INCO budget in that section. • <u>Describe the INCO activities included in your project:</u> If the answer to the previous question is YES, it is mandatory; otherwise, it is not applicable. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed INCO activities.	📌 Dissemination aspect of the project – If project type is Valorisation / Impact → Evaluate dissemination in this question. – If project type is R&D Project → Do NOT evaluate dissemination in this question. – For R&D Projects, the dissemination plan is not explained with the methodology, but in separate section 13. Dissemination Plan, therefore the absence of a dissemination plan in this question should not be penalised. 📌 Originality and innovation: 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. Gantt Chart & Risk Management	6. Gantt Chart & Risk Management
6.1. Gantt Chart	6.1. Gantt Chart
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. 📄 A separate file (Gantt Chart) must be downloaded, completed and uploaded in the Platform. This question concerns the calendar of tasks and deliverables, and the P-M provided by the organisations involved in them. In the Gantt Chart both the work intensity & the overview of the calendar of the work packages, tasks and corresponding deliverables/outputs should be represented: • <u>Gantt Chart (upload)</u>: Mandatory. Please download the template of the Gantt Chart from the blue box of the question or the P4Science 2026 call documents. Complete and upload the file. ✦ Coherence with the Budget Table: Please verify that the PM in the Gantt Chart Correspond with those in the Budget Table in Section 12. Budget. <i>What level of detail should the Gantt Chart show in terms of Work Packages...?</i> – Work Packages: Title Note that there are mandatory Work Packages (WP) – Tasks: Title, Start month, End month. Note: Subtasks are not allowed. – Deliverables: Title, Type of Deliverable, Target group 1, Target group 2 (if any), Target group 3 (if any), End month. ✦ Coherence with the Work Plan: The numbers, and titles of the WP and Tasks must be the same in the Work plan described in Section 5. Methodology, and the Gantt Chart. <i>Mandatory Work Packages:</i> – (Replace X, Y, Z, with sequential numbers as for the other work packages). WP X: Coordination (mandatory for all project types). – WP Y: Data Management (mandatory for R&D Projects - toolbox Level 1 category). Do not forget to include a deliverable labelled Data Management Plan in month 6 at the latest. – WP Z : Valorisation (mandatory for all project types, except Capacity Development - toolbox Level 1 category). <i>Who should be in the Gantt Chart? And where should they be placed?</i>	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All project types. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: – 6.1. Gantt Chart 📄 Document to download: – Gantt Chart – Download from the Documents tab of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), title '<u>Gantt chart (name of the file)</u>', with Comment type 'Full Proposal Attachments'. Tasks – Download the Gantt Chart from the Documents tab. – Evaluate the Gantt Chart, focusing on: – the calendar of tasks – the P-M allocated to the tasks – the distribution of tasks among partners. • Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. • For proposals rated 'Medium Quality' or 'Very Good Quality', describe possible improvements in the comments. Guiding questions <u>Calendar of tasks</u> • Is the calendar of work packages, tasks and deliverables pertinent and realistic? • Is the calendar efficient in terms of synergy and arrangement of the tasks? • Is the duration of the tasks sufficient for their accomplishment? <u>Distribution of tasks</u> • Are the P-M allocated to the tasks adequate? • Have sufficient resources been allocated to complete the project? • Is the distribution of the work among the different teams (Coordinator, Funded Partners and Non-Funded Partners - if present) adequate for the project? • Does the planning show interaction or integration of the different teams, if present? ✦ Empty columns in the Gantt Chart: The Gantt Chart has some empty columns related to reporting. These are not used at the stage of submission, and will be only completed if the project is selected for funding, to monitor its progress.

- The Coordinator's organisation: In the 'Persons-month paid by the project' and, if contributing in kind, in the 'Persons-months other sources.' Please enter the P-M allocated to the tasks in which they are involved. - The Funded Partner(s)' organisation(s): In the 'Persons-month paid by the project' and, if contributing in kind, in the 'Persons-months other sources.' Please enter the P-M allocated to the tasks in which they are involved. - The Subcontractor(s)' organisations: In the 'Persons-month paid by the project'. Please enter the P-M allocated to the tasks in which they are involved. - The Non-Funded Partner(s)' organisations: In the 'Persons-months other sources.' Please enter the P-M allocated to the tasks in which they are involved. ✦ Reporting columns: Do not complete the Tasks & Deliverables Reporting columns (I-M) of the Gantt Chart. These columns are intended only for the follow-up of projects that have been selected for funding.	
(Question does not exist on Full Proposal Form)	6.2 Workplan & Deliverables This Section is not applicable in P4Science.
6.2. List of Risks Related to the Implementation of the Project	6.3. Risk Management
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the implementation risks of the project. • <u>List of Risks...</u>: Mandatory. Enter the number of the task to which the risk is related, provide a title for the risk, and signal the likelihood that it may happen (probability) and the importance of the risk (the impact it would have in the project). ✦ Platform info: You <u>must save each line you enter in this table</u>. Once it is saved, it can only be deleted; the information in each field cannot be modified and the lines cannot be shuffled – this is a technical limitation of the Platform.	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: - All project types. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: - 6.2. List of Risks Related to the Implementation of the Project - Contingency Plan for the Risks Mentioned Above Tasks - Evaluate the risks related to the implementation of the project and the contingency plan proposed by the applicants. - Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. Guiding questions - Have all foreseeable risks been correctly identified? - Is the risk assessment adequately estimated in terms of likelihood and importance? - Are the contingency plans depicted adequate? - Do they provide solid solutions?
6.3. Contingency Plan for the Risks Mentioned Above	
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the risks listed on the previous question, and the contingency plan that will be put in place to mitigate them. • <u>Contingency plan...</u>: Please explain the risks associated to the implementation of the project in relation to the tasks. Mention the specific contingency plan for each of the risk mentioned above.	

7. Data Management Plan	7. Data Management Plan
7.1. Data Management Plan Declarations ➔ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question consists of two declarations regarding Data Management Plan. • <u>DMP document</u>: Mandatory. This is a reminder that you must provide a complete DMP if your project is selected for funding. • <u>DMP deliverable</u>: Mandatory. This is a reminder that you must include a DMP deliverable in the Gantt Chart.	Evaluation of question 7.1. Data Management Plan Declarations (Full Proposal) This section does not require an evaluation.
7.2. Data Summary ➔ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question concerns the data that will be used in the project. • <u>Data summary</u>: Mandatory. – 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).	7.1. Data Management Plan ➔ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – R&D Project ➔ Full Proposal questions to assess: – 7.2. Data Summary – 7.3. Open and FAIR compliance – 7.4. Curation, Storage and Preservation Costs Tasks – Please assess the information provided regarding the data management plan of the project. – Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If the DMP is deemed 'Good Quality' or 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements and recommendations in the comments. Guiding questions <u>Regarding the Summary</u> – Is the description of data and metadata adequate and sufficient? – Has the acquisition, production, and (re)use of data been adequately addressed? – Do data and metadata comply with current standards? <u>Open and FAIR compliance</u> – Do the data & data management comply with FAIR principles? – Is provided Information on Open Access, as well as access provisions and IPR arrangement where relevant, adequately described? – Have the legal issues/aspects of the data been adequately and sufficiently addressed? <u>Curation, storage and preservation costs</u> – 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?
7.3. Open and FAIR compliance ➔ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question concerns the Open and FAIR management of data. • <u>Open and FAIR compliance</u>: Mandatory. – 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.	
7.4. Curation, Storage and Preservation Costs ➔ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question concerns how the data will be curated, stored and preserved.	

- 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.

✦ **This is not a full DMP:** It is just a short version of the Data Management Plan; applicants will have to provide a comprehensive DPM if their project is selected for funding in month 6 of the project.

8. Coordinator	8. Coordinator & Partnership
8.1. Coordinator: Organisation Details	8.1. Coordinator
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the organisation of the Coordinator. ✦ Completed fields: All the fields are already completed with information entered in the Expression of Interest. It is a non-editable section.	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All toolbox project types ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: – 8.1. Coordinator: Organisation Details – 8.2 Coordinator: Promotor – 8.3. Coordinator: Team – 8.4. Coordinator: Top Achievements...
8.2. Coordinator: Promotor	Additional information / Document to download:
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the Coordinator as the promotor of his team. ✦ Completed fields: Some of the fields are already completed with information that was entered in the Expression of Interest. ✦ Gender: The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium. • <u>Number of years active in research</u>: Mandatory. • <u>Number of years of management experience</u>: Mandatory. Note that this has nothing to do with the career stage/level the person has reached, but rather their actual experience managing research projects. • <u>Professional background and relevant experience...</u>: Mandatory. Please enter experience of the promotor that is relevant to the project, including managerial experience.	– Staff information, present in the Budget Table. – The Budget Table is an annex to the description of the proposal – In the ‘Documents tab’ of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), see document titled ‘Budget table (name of the file)’, with Comment type ‘Full Proposal Attachments’. Tasks – Please assess the quality and suitability of the Coordinator (promotor and team) for the proposed project. – Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you select a value below ‘Very Good Quality’, please describe the necessary/possible improvements. Guiding questions – Is the expertise and profile of the Coordinator (promotor and team) a good match for the project? – Does the Coordinator (promotor and team) possess the expertise and experience required to successfully implement the project? – Does the promotor have sufficient experience to manage and coordinate their team and the project?
8.3. Coordinator: Team	Terminology:
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types.	✦ Terminology:

This question concerns the Coordinator's team. This is, staff working from or to be recruited by their institution to work on the project.

✦ **Coherence with the Budget Table:** Make sure that the persons or profiles mentioned, also appear in Question 12.1. Budget of the Project.

✦ **Gender:** The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium.

- **Coordinator: Team:** Please complete if the promotor works with a team of persons within their institution. If the promotor works alone, do not complete.
 - Please enter relevant professional information of the Coordinator's team.
 - You may include researchers/staff belonging to the Coordinator's institution that will be working on the project as part of their team.
 - In case the team is still unknown, please provide a short description of the profile you are looking for.
 - Mention only persons that are listed/named in the Budget table, under the Coordinator's Staff budget.
 - Include both staff paid by the project and working in-kind for the project.

8.4. Coordinator: Top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects

➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types.

This question contains information regarding the promotor and their team (if there is one). You must provide information on achievements, milestones, publications and projects that are relevant to the proposal.

- **Coordinator: Top Achievements....:** Mandatory.
 - Please provide a list of maximum of 5 relevant top achievements, milestones, and (peer-reviewed) publications achieved over the past 5 years.
 - Provide a list of maximum of 5 relevant projects, with details: Acronym, weblink, duration in months, funding source and role (Coordinator or Partner). Please provide a URL if available.

- Coordinator: the institution/organisation that coordinates the project. BELSPO may also refer to the promotor and the team collectively as 'Coordinator'. The Coordinator is partially or totally funded by the project.
- Promotor: the person representing the institution/organisation that is implementing, and in this specific case, leading the proposed project.
- Team: the persons working for the promotor, in the promotor's institution/organisation.

✦ **Promotor:** Promotors should be assessed on their demonstrated abilities and achievements relative to their career stage and level of experience. Early career researchers should not be penalised for lack of experience.

✦ **Team:** Having a team is not mandatory. If present, staff working under the promotor are listed in the Budget Table (separate file), and described in question 8.3. of the Full Proposal. If team members have not yet been recruited, they may be referred to as 'staff 1', 'staff 2', etc. This is normal and must not be evaluated negatively.

✦ **Gender** is not evaluated here.

9. Funded Partner(s)

9.1. Funded Partner 1 – 9.X. Funded Partner X (up to 10)	8.2. Funded Partners
9.1.1. Funded Partner: Organisation details ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types, for projects that include Funded Partners. This question concerns the organisation of the Funded-Partner. 🔴 Completed fields: All the fields are already completed with information that was entered in the Expression of Interest. It is a non-editable section.	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All toolbox project types ➡ Presence or absence of partners: – This question applies only to projects that include Funded Partners. – The presence of Funded Partners is signalled by the applicants in the Full Proposal: 1.3. Funded & Non-Funded Partners. – If there are none, the question must not be evaluated.
9.2. Funded Partner: Promotor ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types, for projects that include Funded Partners. This question concerns the Funded Partner as the promotor of his team. 🔴 Completed fields: some of the fields are already completed with information that was entered in the Expression of Interest. 🔴 Gender: The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium. • <u>Number of years active in research:</u> Mandatory. • <u>Number of years of management experience:</u> Mandatory. Note that this has nothing to do with the career stage/level the person has reached, but rather their actual experience managing research projects. • <u>Professional background and relevant experience...:</u> Mandatory. Please enter experience of the promotor that is relevant to the project, including managerial experience.	➡ Full Proposal subsections / questions to assess: – 9.1. to 9.X Funded Partner – Note that each sub-section is comprised of 4 questions that you must evaluate here: 9.1.1. Funded Partner: Organisation Details 9.1.2 Funded Partner: Promotor 9.1.3. Funded Partner: Team 9.1.4. Funded Partner: Top Achievements... 🔴 Additional information / Document to download: – Staff information, present in the Budget Table. – The Budget Table is an annex to the description of the proposal – In the ‘Documents tab’ of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), see document titled ‘Budget table (name of the file)’, with Comment type ‘Full Proposal Attachments’. Tasks – Check whether there are Funded Partners in the Full Proposal and answer the question regarding their presence accordingly. – If there are Funded Partners, please assess the quality and suitability of of each Funded Partner (promotor and team) for the proposed project. – Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you select a value below ‘Very Good Quality’, please describe the necessary/possible improvements.
9.3. Funded Partner: Team ➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types, for projects that include Funded Partners. This question concerns the Funded Partner’s team. This is staff working from or to be recruited by their institution to work on the project. 🔴 Coherence with the Budget Table: Make sure that the persons or profiles mentioned, also appear in Question 12.1. Budget of the Project.	Guiding questions – For each Funded Partner individually, is the expertise and profile (promotor and team) a good match for the project? – Does each Funded Partner possess sufficient expertise and experience to successfully deliver their contribution to the project? – Does the promotor have sufficient experience to lead and coordinate their team?

- ✦ **Gender:** The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium.
- **Funded Partner: Team:** Please complete if the promotor works with a team of persons within their institution. If the promotor works alone, do not complete.
 - Please enter relevant professional information of the Funded Partner's team.
 - You may include researchers/staff belonging to the Funded Partner's institution that will be working on the project as part of their team.
 - In case the team is still unknown, please provide a short description of the profile you are looking for.
Mention only persons that are listed/named in the Budget table, under the Coordinator's Staff budget.
 - Include both staff paid by the project and working in-kind for the project.

9.4. Funded Partner: Top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects

↻ **This question applies to: All toolbox project types, for projects that include Funded Partners.**

This question concerns the promotor and their team (if there is one). You must provide information on achievements, milestones, publications and projects that are relevant to the proposal.

- **Funded Partner: Top Achievements...:** Mandatory.
 - Please provide a list of maximum of 5 relevant top achievements, milestones, and (peer-reviewed) publications achieved over the past 5 years.
 - Provide a list of maximum of 5 relevant projects, with details: Acronym, weblink, duration in months, funding source and role (Coordinator or Partner). Please provide a URL if available.

✦ **Team:** The staff working under a given Funded Partner may not have been yet confirmed. In this case, it is possible that the applicants signal 'staff 1, 'staff 2'... etc, instead of writing the names of the persons concerned. This should not be evaluated negatively.

✦ **Promotor:** Promotors should be assessed on their demonstrated abilities and achievements relative to their career stage and level of experience. Early career researchers should not be penalised for lack of experience.

✦ **Gender is not** evaluated here.

10. Non-Funded Partner(s)

10.1. Non-Funded Partner 1 – 10.X. Non-Funded Partner X (up to 10)

↻ **This question applies to: All toolbox project types, for projects that include Non-Funded Partners.**

This question concerns the Non-Funded Partner.

8.3. Non-Funded Partners

↻ **This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:**

- All toolbox project types

↻ **Presence or absence of partners:**

- This question applies only to projects that include Non-Funded Partners.

✦ **Gender:** The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium.

Please provide information on their personal and professional details, and state:

- Professional background relevant to the project: Mandatory.
- Type of contribution: Mandatory. State if the contribution is in kind, cash or both.
- Contribution in €: This field only appears if you selected a cash contribution.
- Description of the contribution: Mandatory. Describe the aspects of the project that are of interest to the Non-Funded Partner, their contribution and their motivation to participate in the project.

- The presence of Non-Funded Partners is signalled by the applicants in the Full Proposal: 1.3. Funded & Non-Funded Partners.
- If there are none, the question must not be evaluated.

➡ **Full Proposal subsections to assess:**

- 10.1. to 10.X Non-Funded Partner.

Tasks

- Check whether there are Non-Funded Partners in the Full Proposal and answer the question regarding their presence accordingly.
- If there are Non-Funded Partners, please assess the quality, suitability and expected contribution of each Non-Funded Partner to the proposed project.

Guiding questions

- Does each of the Non-Funded Partners possess sufficient expertise and competencies to support the project?
- Are their proposed contributions appropriate, clearly defined and of sufficient quality?
- Does the presence of the Non-Funded Partners add value to the project?

✦ **Note** that gender is **not** evaluated here.

11. Partnership: Combined Expertise of the Consortium (Coordinator, Funded and/or Non-funded partners)

11.1. Combined Expertise of the Consortium

➡ **This question applies to: All toolbox project types, provided they include Funded and/or Non-Funded Partners.**

This question concerns how the Coordinator, Funded Partners and/or Non-Funded partners work together.

✦ **Gender:** The gender aspect is not explained here, but in Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium.

- Combined expertise of the Consortium: Mandatory. 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.

8.4. Combined Expertise of the Consortium & Gender in the Consortium.

➡ **This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:**

- All toolbox project types

➡ **Presence or absence of partners:**

- This question applies only to projects that include Funded and/or Non-Funded Partners.
- The presence of Non-Funded Partners is signalled by the applicants in the Full Proposal: 1.3. Funded & Non-Funded Partners.
- If there are none, the question must not be evaluated.

➡ **Full Proposal questions to assess:**

- 11.1. Combined Expertise of the Consortium
- Question 15.1. Gender in the Consortium

	Tasks • Please evaluate the adequacy of the Consortium, taking into account the Coordinator and the Funded Partners with their teams, and the Non-Funded Partners. • Please evaluate the gender balance in the Consortium but only for the promotor. • Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you have selected a value below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements Guiding questions <u>The Consortium</u> • Does the expertise, methods, experience provided by the ensemble of partners, contribute adequately to achieve the objectives of the project? • Does the Consortium cover the full scope of the project, or are there any gaps? • Does the presence of Funded and Non-Funded Partners add value to the project? • Is the involvement of the partners justified in terms of their role and expected contributions? • Have all network opportunities been explored? <u>Gender in the Consortium</u> • Is the Consortium (counting only the promotor) diverse and balanced in terms of gender? • Does the proposal include ways to improve gender balance, if it has not yet been achieved? • 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? ✦ Gender in the Consortium is evaluated here. Gender balance in the Consortium is assessed only for promotor, as team composition may evolve during project implementation.
--	--

12. Budget	9. Budget
12.1. Budget of the Project	9.1. Budget
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the budget of the project. <u>Budget of the Project (upload)</u>: Mandatory. Please download the template of the Budget Table from the blue box of the question or the P4Science 2026 call documents. Complete and upload the file.	➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: – All toolbox project types ➡ Full Proposal question to assess: – 12.1. Budget of the Project 📄 Document to download: – Budget Table

✦ **Coherence with Gantt Chart:** Please verify that the number of PM in the Gantt Chart correspond to the number of PM in the Budget Table.

- Can be downloaded from the Documents tab of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), titled 'Budget Table (name of the file)', with Comment type 'Full Proposal Attachments'.

Tasks

- Please assess the proposed budget for the Coordinator and the Funded Partners in relation to the project's objective and activities.
- Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you select a value below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements.

Guiding questions

- Will the budget realistically allow the project to achieve its objectives and deliver the expected outcomes?
- Does the budget take into account all the aspects of the project, and is it adequate and proportionate to the activities proposed?
- Is the budget well-balanced among the Coordinator and the Funded Partners and proportionate to their contribution? (if applicable)

✦ **Team:** The staff working under the Coordinator or a given Funded Partner may not have been yet confirmed. In this case, it is possible that the applicants signal 'staff 1', 'staff 2'... etc, instead of writing the names of the persons concerned. This should have no negative impact in the evaluation.

✦ **Compliance with budget rules:** BELSPO will check that the budget items belong in the right budget category, that institutions present as Funded Partners are eligible to receive funding from BELSPO, and that the project complies with the budget rules of the call.

13. Dissemination

13.1. Description of the Dissemination Plan

➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category.

This question concerns the description of the dissemination plan.

✦ **R&D Projects:** The dissemination aspect of the proposal must be included in this section for R&D Projects. Valorisation / Impact projects (toolbox level 1 category) cannot complete this section; they must include the dissemination plan under Section 5. Methodology, as dissemination is the major component of these projects.

✦ **Gender:** Do not comment on gender here. Section 15. Gender contains a specific question for the Dissemination Plan.

10. Dissemination Plan

10.1. Dissemination Plan

➡ **This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:**

- R&D Project

➡ **Full Proposal question to assess:**

- 13.1. Description of the Dissemination Plan

📄 **Additional information / Document to download:**

- Dissemination deliverables present in the Gantt Chart.
- The Gantt Chart is an annex to the description of the proposal – In the 'Documents tab' of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), see document titled 'Gantt chart (name of the file)', with Comment type 'Full Proposal Attachments'.

- Description of the Dissemination Plan: Mandatory. Please provide a dissemination plan for the project, referring to the deliverables listed in the Gantt Chart that intended for dissemination. Describe, for each targeted group, how and in what form the plan will be implemented.

Tasks

- Please evaluate the Dissemination Plan proposed, assessing its capacity to disseminate the results and knowledge generated by the project to appropriate audiences.
- Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you have selected a value below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements.

Guiding questions

- Are the proposed dissemination deliverables appropriate for the foreseen targeted audiences?
- Are the proposed communication tools appropriate for the intended dissemination activities and target audiences?
- Will the plan be successful in promoting the results and acquired knowledge?
- Will the plan enable the access to and use of the results and data produced?

✦ **Gender** is **not** evaluated here.

14. Follow-Up Committee

14.1. List of Potential Follow-up Committee Members

↻ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category.

This question concerns the composition of the Follow-up Committee of the project. Note that members must be potential users of the results of the project. They may come from national or regional public bodies, EU or international institutions, civil society, the scientific community, or the industrial sector.

✦ **The objective of the committee** is to actively follow-up on the project, assist in the valorisation of the research, etc., via exchange and provision of data and information, giving advice, etc.

✦ **Follow-up Committee Members are not paid for their work.** However the cost of the activities of the Follow-up Committee may be budgeted under Specific Operation Costs.

- List of potential Follow-up Committee members: Mandatory. Please list the potential members of the committee, providing the following information:
 - Institution
 - Member name (if unknown, indicate 'Member 1', 'Member 2', etc.
 - Degree of implication in the project: Consulted / Informed / Involved.

11. Follow-Up Committee

11.1. Follow-Up Committee

↻ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:

- R&D Project

↻ Full Proposal questions to assess:

- 14.1. List of Potential Follow-up Committee Members
- 14.2. Contribution of each Follow-up Committee member to the project
- 14.3. Way of working of the Follow-up Committee.

Tasks

- Please evaluate the composition, contribution and way of working of the Follow-up Committee.
- Base your assessment on the type of profiles and institutions/organisations and their involvement, rather than on the specific persons listed.
- Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments.

Guiding questions

- Is the composition of Follow-up Committee coherent with the needs of the project?
- Is the proposed role of the members (informed, consulted, involved) adequate for the project?

14.2. Contribution of each Follow-up Committee Member to the Project

➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category.

This question concerns the contribution to the project of the Follow-up Committee members mentioned above.

✦ Gender: Do not comment on gender here. Section 15. Gender contains a specific question for the Follow-up Committee.

- Contribution of each Follow-up Committee Member...: Mandatory. Please describe the expected contribution to the project and the role of each member.
 - If the person is still unknown, refer to the foreseen institution / organisation.
 - Explain why each member is relevant to the project.

14.3. Way of Working of the Follow-up Committee

➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category.

This question concerns the manner in which the Follow-up Committee will work in support of the project.

- Way of Working...: Mandatory. Please describe how the Follow-up Committee will work, indicating:
 - How it will support the project, including providing advice, validation, feedback...
 - How often and in which format will the committee meet (online, in-person, hybrid...)
 - How information will be shared between the committee and the project team.

- Is the way of working (number of meetings, method of information exchange) in line with the needs of the project?
- If non-scientific stakeholders are relevant for the project, are they involved in the early stages of the project (co-creation of results) ?

✦ **Confirmation of members:** Members of the Follow-up Committee may not have been yet confirmed. In this case, it is possible that the applicants signal 'member 1, 'member 2'... etc, instead of writing the names of the persons concerned. This should not negatively impact the evaluation of the proposal.

✦ **Gender** is **not** evaluated here.

✦ **Remuneration:** Members of the Follow-up Committee are not remunerated.

15. Gender

15.1. Gender in the research consortium

➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types, provided they include Funded and/or Non-Funded Partners.

This question concerns the gender composition and balance in the project consortium, understood as the promoters that take part in the project (teams excluded).

- Gender in the Research Consortium: Mandatory. Please explain the gender composition and balance in the consortium (only promoters):
 - Explain how all gender groups can fairly and equally contribute to the project.
 - Elaborate on how potential imbalances will be mitigated.

12. Gender

Evaluation of question 15.1. Gender in the Research Consortium (Full Proposal)

This section is evaluated as part of question 8.4. Combined Expertise of the Consortium & Gender in the Consortium. It is not evaluated here.

15.2. Gender balance in the Follow-up Committee ➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question concerns the gender composition and balance in the Follow-up Committee. - <u>Gender balance in the Follow-up Committee:</u> Mandatory. Please explain the gender composition and balance in the Follow-up Committee: - Explain how all gender groups within the committee can fairly and equally contribute to the project. - Elaborate on how potential imbalances will be mitigated.	12.1. Gender balance in the Follow-up Committee and Dissemination / Outreach aspects of the project. ➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 categories: - R&D Project - Valorisation / Impact ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: - <u>For R&D Projects:</u> 15.2. Gender Balance in the Follow-up Committee 15.3. Gender balance in the Dissemination / Outreach aspects of the Project. - <u>For Valorisation / Impact projects:</u> 15.3. Gender balance in the Dissemination / Outreach aspects of the Project (There is no Follow-up Committee for Valorisation / Impact projects).
15.3. Gender Balance in the Dissemination / Outreach aspects of the Project ➡ This question applies to: R&D Project <u>and</u> Valorisation / Impact toolbox level 1 categories. This question concerns the gender balance in the dissemination / outreach aspects of the project. - <u>Gender Balance in the Dissemination...:</u> Mandatory. Please explain how gender balance is considered in the dissemination and outreach activities of the project: - How will the project ensure that all dissemination and outreach activities are free from gender bias, and provide equal opportunities for all gender groups (measures, indicators, monitoring, etc.)? - How will the team(s) ensure the oversight and acting on feedback?	🔗 Additional information / Document to download: - Dissemination deliverables present in the Gantt Chart. - The Gantt Chart is an annex to the description of the proposal – In the ‘Documents tab’ of the application (also labelled as Correspondence log), see document titled ‘Gantt chart (name of the file)’, with Comment type ‘Full Proposal Attachments’. Tasks - For a R&D Project: Evaluate the two gender questions (Follow-up and Dissemination) mentioned above. - For a Valorisation/Impact project: Evaluate only the gender question related to Dissemination (there is no Follow-up Committee). - If applicants identify no relevant gender issues, please assess whether their justification is sufficient. - Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you have selected a value below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements. Guiding questions: <u>Follow-up Committee:</u> - Have the applicants considered gender balance when composing the Follow-up Committee? - Is the composition of the Follow-up Committee gender balanced? - What actions are planned to mitigate potential imbalances? - Does the proposal adequately describe how the project will ensure that all gender groups within the committee can fairly and equally contribute to the committee as foreseen in the way of working, and can access and participate in activities? <u>Dissemination / Outreach :</u> - Has gender been sufficiently considered in the outreach & dissemination strategy? - Have potential biases, risks (and opportunities) been identified and sufficiently reflected upon?

	- Will the project ensure that all dissemination and outreach activities are free from gender bias, and provide equal opportunities for all gender groups (measures, indicators, monitoring, etc.)? - How will the team(s) ensure the oversight and acting on feedback? Is this sufficiently reflected upon?
15.4. Gender Dimension in the Content of the Project ➡ This question applies to: R&D Project toolbox level 1 category. This question concerns the gender aspects in the content of the research. Indicate if there is a gender dimension in the content of your project, and if so, explain how the gender dimension(s) are integrated in the research project. ♦ Note that only <u>human</u> sex/gender aspects need to be accounted for. - <u>Is there a gender dimension in the content of the research?:</u> Mandatory. YES/NO. - <u>Please explain the Gender Dimension in the Content of the Project:</u> Mandatory, it appears only when you answer YES to the previous question. Explain how the gender dimension(s) are integrated in the research design, including: - Collection and analysis of sex/gender-specific data. - Relevance to research objectives, methodology, data management plan. - Potential influence of outcomes: How might research results impact sex/gender groups differently. Measures taken to address the sex/gender potential issues/biases related to inequality in the project. - Consider intersectionality where appropriate. - <u>Please explain why there is no Gender Dimension in the Content of the Project:</u> Mandatory, it appears only when you answer NO to the first question.	12.2. Gender Dimension in the Content of the Project ➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: - R&D Project ➡ Full Proposal question to assess: - 15.4. Gender Dimension in the Content of the Project. Tasks • Please evaluate whether the applicants have correctly identified the presence or absence of a sex and/or gender dimension in content of the project. • If a sex and/or gender dimension is present, assess whether it has been correctly identified integrated in the research project. • If no sex and/or gender dimension is identified, assess whether the justification provided is sufficient. • Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. If you have selected a value below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements. Guiding questions • Have (human) sex and/or gender considerations been adequately assessed in relation to the research objectives, methodology, data collection, analysis and expected outcomes? • If the research involves human participants, have sex and/or gender differences been appropriately considered in the sampling strategy, data collection and analysis? • Are the proposed methods and research instruments suitable for identifying relevant sex and/or gender differences? • Have potential sex- and/or gender-differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research been considered? • Does the proposal adequately explain how identified sex and/or gender issues will be addressed throughout the project? • If no sex and/or gender dimension is identified, is the justification provided adequate?

16. Ethics & Knowledge Security		13. Ethics & Knowledge Security	
16.1. Types of Ethical and Knowledge Security Issues		13.1. Ethics & Knowledge Security	
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the type of ethical and knowledge security issues related to your project. Different types of such issues are proposed: Life sciences; animal welfare; environment, health & safety; interaction with humans in social context; data, privacy and artificial intelligence; colonial, post-colonial and identity; international partnerships, security and dual use; other ethical issues. ✦ Boxes marked with (e): <u>Ticking the boxes marked with (e)</u> requires receiving ethical approval from the competent <u>ethics committee</u> (at the level of your institution or higher) at the latest before initiating any of the research activities concerned. <u>Types of Ethical and Knowledge Security Issues</u>: It is a first general question regarding types of ethical issues, that will prompt further questions depending on your choice. - Please signal the type of ethical and knowledge security issues if there are any. Further questions will appear for the categories; - Leave blank, if there are no ethical and knowledge security issues in your project. <u>No Ethical and/or Knowledge Security Issues</u>: If it is the case, please signal that there are no issues; otherwise, leave blank.		➡ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category: - All toolbox project types. ➡ Full Proposal questions to assess: 16.1. Types of Ethical and Knowledge Security Issues 16.2. Comments on Ethical and Knowledge Security Issues Tasks - Please consult the documents linked in the form. - Please assess whether the applicants have correctly identified and addressed any ethical and knowledge security issues relevant to the proposed project. - If applicants identify no relevant ethical and knowledge security issues, please assess whether their justification is sufficient. - If you have selected a value below 'Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements. Scoring This question is scored with an OK / NOT OK: - Choose OK if ethical and knowledge issues or the absence thereof has been adequately identified and assessed by the applicants. - Choose NOT OK, if ethical and knowledge issues or the absence thereof has NOT been adequately identified and assessed by the applicants Guiding questions - Have all the relevant ethical / knowledge security issues of the project been defined? - Which ones were either not defined, or not sufficiently elaborated upon? - Will the project handle these ethical / knowledge security issues adequately? ✦ Note: Documents linked in the form: The Belgian Code of Conduct for more information, the BELSPO guidelines on Knowledge Security in research, and the EU Commission's living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research.	
16.2. Comments on Ethical and Knowledge Security Issues			
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types. This question concerns the explanation of the ethical and/or knowledge security issues signalled in the previous question, or the absence thereof. <u>Comments on ethical and ...</u>: Mandatory. This question will apply if you have signalled any issues. Please describe the ethical issues you marked in the previous question. <u>Please explain why there are no ethical...</u>: Mandatory. This question will apply if you have signalled that there are no issues. Please describe why your project is not concerned by any ethical and/or knowledge security issues.			
16.3. Ethics declarations			
➡ This question applies to: All toolbox project types.		This section does not require evaluation.	

This question contains a number of declarations relative to ethics and knowledge security issues, that also act as a reminder for the researchers to uphold their ethical engagements. All of the declarations are Mandatory.

This section is only available to the evaluator

14. Strengths and Weaknesses

➔ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:

- All toolbox project types.
- Please list the strengths and weaknesses of the project using bullet points and short sentences.
- When possible, mention the part of the proposal to which your comment refers (example: Question 3.1. Description of State of the Art).
- Use neutral and respectful language.

This section is only available to the evaluator.

15. Recommendations for the Improvement of the Proposal

➔ This question applies to toolbox level 1 category:

- All toolbox project types.
- Please provide constructive recommendations to improve the proposal.
- This is not a funding recommendation. Do not state whether the proposal should or should not be funded.
- Recommendations should be consistent with the identified strengths and weaknesses, and well as the overall evaluation of the proposal.
- Please use neutral and respectful language.

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 - Project information (scope, state of the art, project 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 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)