

FULL PROPOSALS (POLICY DRIVEN) CALL 2026:

SUBMISSION CONTENT FOR APPLICANTS VERSUS EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR INDIVIDUAL REMOTE EVALUATORS

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

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

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

1. General Information	
1.1. Project ID	
General information. Some of the information is automatically filled out by the system.	This section does not require an evaluation.
1.2. Funded & Non-Funded Partners	
Indicate whether you will include Funded and/or Non-Funded Partners in your proposal. You have to indicate this here to activate the corresponding tabs in the online form in the platform.	This section does not require an evaluation.
1.3. Declarations	
Accept the mandatory declarations to be able to submit your proposal.	This section does not require an evaluation.

Next page

SECTION A: SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

2. Proposal Summary	
Please provide: Acronym – Title, Summary, Summary of Expected Outputs and Keywords 1-6. The information is copied from the Expression of Interest. Edits can only be made, if the scope of the project is not significantly altered.	This section does not require an evaluation.
3. State of the Art	
3.1. Description of the State of the Art	
Describe the State of the Art in relation to the Research Priority and your proposal. Describe the state of current knowledge at national and international level on the topic of the project (<i>about 1 page/1800 char.</i>).	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.
3.2. Bibliographic references	
Provide the bibliographic references of the description of the State of the Art.	This section does not require evaluation.
4. Project Objectives & Scope	
4.1. Research Priority	
Provide the research priority you are applying for.	This section does not require evaluation.
4.2. Project Objectives	
Provide the objectives of the project (list and explain). List and elaborate on the project objectives, including how the objectives relate to the state of the art (previous section) (<i>about 2 pages/3000 char.</i>). In 4.3 elaborate further on how the project and its objectives will contribute to the scope of the call/research priority (<i>about 1/2 pages/750 char.</i>).	Please assess the quality, coherency and feasibility of the (list of) project objectives. Please elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. • <i>Are the research objectives well-developed, clear and coherent?</i> • <i>Are these objectives feasible within the duration and the budget of the project?</i> • <i>Does the selection of research objectives reflect the original call proposal adequately, and cover the full scope of the proposal?</i> • <i>Will these objectives enable the accomplishment of the project's outcome and scientific requests?</i>
4.3. Compliance with the Scope of the Research Priority	
Explain how the project will contribute to the scope of the research priority.	IN / partially OUT/ OUT of scope evaluation Please indicate whether the project proposal is in scope, partially out of scope or totally out of scope. Provide a statement on your assessment in the comments section. The scope of the call refers to both the “scope” and the “scientific requests” as described in the Information File S4P 2026 (section 3: Research Priorities of the Call, pp. 11 – 36).

	Note: - If you consider the proposal as 'OUT of scope', end your evaluation here. However, provide argumentation why the proposal is out of scope. - If you consider the proposal 'IN scope' OR 'partially OUT of scope', you must complete the rest of the evaluation. - Proposals 'partially OUT of scope' may only be financed based upon the agreement of the Panel, who may impose adequate adjustments for it to be 'IN scope'.
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) (<i>min. 8 pages/28 000 char., max. 10 pages/36 000 char.</i>). ▶ Workplan description → Section 7: Question 7.2 ▶ List of deliverables → Section 7: upload Gantt Chart ▶ Overview of Data sources & Management → Section 6: Data Management Plan (section 6) ▶ Gender dimension in the research & Ethics (including responsible use of AI in the research) → Section 15: Gender & Section 16: Ethics & Research Security. ▶ Dissemination plan & deliverables → Section 13	Please evaluate the approach undertaken. Elaborate on your reasoning in the comments. <i>Is the methodology transparent, described clearly and sufficiently extensive?</i> <i>Does the chosen methodology cover all relevant aspects of the scientific requests, scope of the proposal and list of objectives?</i> <i>Are the expected outcomes of the project achievable by means of the methodology presented?</i> Note: not all projects need to be original or innovative, but the approach undertaken must be within scope and adequately explained in the scope of the proposal (see point 4). E.g. a project can be deemed 'excellent' even if it is not innovative, provided there is adequate argumentation (in reference to point 4), as not all research priorities in the call request novel or innovative research.

SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL

6. Data Management Plan	
6.1. Data Management Plan Declarations	
Read the declarations.	This section does not require evaluation.
6.2. Data Plan & Summary	
Provide information regarding the data that will be used in the project. - 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).	Sections 6.2 – 6.5 are evaluated together. 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.
6.3. Open and FAIR compliance	
Provide information on the Open and FAIR management of data. - 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.	Summary <i>Is the description of data and metadata adequate and sufficient?</i> <i>Has the acquisition, production, and (re)use of data been adequately addressed?</i> <i>Do data and metadata comply with current standards?</i>

Licensing for data sharing and tools/software/models for data generation and validation/interpretation/re-use to ensure the re-usability of the data.	
6.4. 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.	Open and FAIR compliance <i>Do the data & data management comply with FAIR principles?</i> <i>Is provided Information on Open Access, as well as access provisions and IPR arrangement where relevant, adequately described?</i> <i>Have the legal issues/aspects of the data been adequately and sufficiently addressed?</i>
6.5. Data Security & GDPR compliance Provide information regarding data security and GDPR compliance. - Please explain how you will ensure that the data are securely stored and not accessed or modified by unauthorized persons. - if applicable: Please elaborate shortly how the project would handle Federal Administrative Data provided by the co-funding Federal Administration, & how data & other materials - such as drafts of reports - will be securely shared between third parties.	Curation, storage and preservation costs <i>Are the data storage and back-up adequately and sufficiently described?</i> <i>Are the measures foreseen by the team to curate, store and enable reuse of the data according to FAIR principles satisfactory?</i> Data security and GDPR compliance <i>Are all security measures that are relevant at proposal level (correctly) identified? And are methods to mitigate related risks sufficiently addressed?</i> <i>Has the project team reflected upon how data could be safely shared between stakeholders, and is it appropriate?</i>
7. Workplan, Gantt Chart & Risk Management	
7.1. Gantt Chart & List of Deliverables	
In the Gantt Chart both the work intensity & the overview of the work packages, tasks and corresponding deliverables/outputs should be represented: <i>Who should be in the Gantt Chart?</i> The coordinator, the funded partner(s) (including staff working in-kind) + non-funded partners, subcontractors. ▶ Please download the provided Gantt Chart template, complete it and upload it to the platform. ▶ Note that some work packages are marked X, Y, Z. You may substitute these letters by numbers, as for the other work packages. However, keep in mind that these are mandatory. ▶ Please add staff of the Coordinator and/or Funded Partner(s) that are working in-kind to the Gantt Chart as well. ▶ Please add the tasks of the Non-Funded Partners as well. ▶ Please verify that the PM in the Gantt Chart Correspond with those in the Budget Table ▶ A detailed elaboration of the work packages, tasks & deliverables (excluding dissemination) can be done in question 7.2 🔗 Please note that the Gantt Chart is reflects the total budget, including co-funding amount: The S4Policy funding is a co-financed structure, meaning that for each source of funding a contract will be drafted: one with BELSPO, and one with each relevant Federal Public Service. However, at	Please refer to the description of the Workplan (7.2) and the Gantt chart (separate file). 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.

proposal level, you should combine the budget from BELSPO and the relevant Federal Public Service when filling out the Gantt Chart, as such providing an overview of PM of the TOTAL budget.		
7.2. Workplan Description		
Please provide the description of the Workplan: ► Description for each work package (WP) ► (short) Description for each task within the work packages ► Where relevant, a (short) description of the output, deliverables or milestones related to a task or WP.	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: • <i>Are the WP's, tasks, and deliverables coherent with the objectives, methodology and expected results of the project?</i> • <i>Does the description of the work plan correspond to the Gantt chart?</i> Please provide an overall assessment of the requested level of PM 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. Note: The WP dissemination, or tasks & deliverables related to dissemination in WP's, are not evaluated here, but later in Point 13.	
7.3. List of risks related to the implementation of the project		
► Please enter the risks associated to the implementation of the project in relation to the tasks. ► Number the risks following the number of the tasks: ► Signal the likelihood of the risk (probability that it may occur), and its importance.	Sections 7.3 and 7.4 are evaluated together. Please evaluate the risk assessment: Are all risks identified? Assess the quality of the contingency plans provided, if they correspond to the risk assessment and are tested accordingly.	
7.4. Contingency plan for the risks mentioned above ► 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.		
8. Coordinator		
8.1. Coordinator: Organisation details		
Provide the information about the Coordinating organisation. 🔗 Note that some of the fields are already completed with information that was entered in the Expression of Interest.	Sections 8.1 – 8.4 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 team is deemed below 'Very Good Quality', please describe the necessary/possible improvements. <i>Please consider guiding questions:</i> • <i>Are the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the coordinator a good match for the project?</i> • <i>Does the coordinator have sufficient experience as a manager to coordinate the project?</i>	
8.2. Coordinator: Promotor		
Provide professional information of the Promotor. 🔗 Note that some of the fields are already completed with information that was entered in the Expression of Interest.		
8.3. Coordinator: Team		

► Please enter relevant professional information of the Coordinator's team. <i>In the case it is already known which researchers/staff will be working on the project or part of the team that is known. In case the team is still unknown, please provide a <u>short</u> description of the profile you are looking for.</i> ► Mention only persons that are 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. <i>This question refers to staff belonging to the same institution of the Coordinator (or to be hired within the same institution) that will be working for the project.</i>	
8.4. Coordinator: past top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects For the Coordinator and their team: ► 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. <i>You are required to provide top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects in which the Coordinator and their team have participated. These need to be relevant to the project proposal.</i>	
9. Funded Partner(s)	
9.1. Funded Partner 1 – 9.X. Funded Partner X (up to 10)	
9.1.1. Funded Partner: Organisation details Provide the information about the Partner organisation. 🔗 Note that some of the fields are already completed with the information you entered in the Expression of Interest. 🔗 Note that new Funded Partners added AFTER the submission of the Eoi, will first go through an eligibility check by Belspo. Belspo will contact the applicant when there is an issue.	Sections 9.X.1 – 9.X.4 are evaluated together. Please assess the quality of the individual funded partners within the frame of the project. Please consider guiding questions: • <i>If the project has multiple partners: is the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the partner a good match for the project?</i>
9.2. Funded Partner: Promotor Provide professional information of the Promotor. 🔗 Note that some of the fields are already completed with the information you entered in the Expression of Interest.	
9.3. Funded Partner: Team	

In the case it is already known which researchers & staff members would be included: ▶ Please enter relevant professional information of the Funded Partner's team, this is the staff working (in-kind) for the Funded Partner & under supervision of the Promotor. <i>In case the team is still unknown, please provide a <u>short</u> description of the profile you are looking for</i> ▶ Mention only persons named in the Budget table, under the Funded Partner's Staff budget. ▶ Include both staff paid by the project, and working in kind for the project. <i>This question refers to staff belonging to the same institution of the Funded Partner (or to be hired within the same institution) that will be working for the project.</i>	
9.4. Funded Partner: past top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects	
For the Funded Partner and their team: ▶ 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. <i>You are required to provide top achievements, milestones, (peer-reviewed) publications and projects in which the Funded Partner and their team have participated. These need to be relevant to the project proposal.</i>	
10. Non-Funded Partner(s)	
10.1. Non-Funded Partner 1 – 10.X. Non-Funded Partner X (up to 10)	
▶ Please provide general personal and professional details of the Non-Funded Partner. ▶ Explain the professional background of the Non-Funded Partner that is relevant to the project. ▶ Describe the aspects of the project that are of interest to the Non-Funded Partner, and their motivation to participate in the project. ▶ Describe the type of contribution cash, in kind, or both, of the Non-Funded Partner to the project.	Please assess the quality of the individual non-funded partners within the frame of the project. Please consider guiding questions: • <i>If the project has multiple partners: Is the individual quality, expertise, and adequacy of the partner a good match for the project?</i>
11. Partnership: Combined expertise of the consortium (coordinator, funded and/or non-funded partners)	
Describe how all project partners will provide the scientific expertise needed for the project, and the added value associated to addressing the research topic as a network of researchers (<i>max. 3999 char.</i>).	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: • <i>Does the experience of all partners (coordinator, funded and non-funded partners) cover the full scope of the research project to reach the objectives?</i> • <i>Are all network opportunities explored?</i>
12. Budget	

Please consult the **BUDGET RULES** file on the **S4Policy** website.

- ▶ Please download the **provided Budget Table template**, complete it and upload it to the platform.
- ▶ Please verify that the number of PM in the Gantt Chart correspond to the number of PM in the Budget Table.

Please assess if the is budget 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 score in the comments.

Whether budget items belong to the correct category, and staff and/or new Funded Partner institutions (added after submission of the EoI) are eligible to receive funding, will be evaluated by Belspo. However please do take into account the overall quality and overall compliance to the rules in your assessment.

SECTION C: OUTREACH AND DISSEMINATION

13. Dissemination

13.1. Description of the dissemination plan

List & elaborate on your dissemination deliverables.

Please refer to all the deliverables marked as 'dissemination' in the Gantt Chart.

Describe, for each targeted group, how and in what form the dissemination plan is to be implemented.

✎ **Note** that all deliverables, including those regarding dissemination, impact, etc. have to be included in the Gantt Chart as well. In the Gantt Chart, the type of deliverable & target audience can be chosen. It is not mandatory to copy the type and target audience for each deliverable here if it is not relevant.

Please assess the capacity of the research team to:

- Promote the results and acquired knowledge
- Enable (peer-reviewed) publication to the academic community and broader public
- Enable access to and use of data. Furthermore, assess the accuracy of selected targeted audiences, the appropriateness of communication tools and approaches, etc.

Please elaborate on your score in the comments.

14. Follow-Up Committee

14.1. List of potential follow-up committee members

More information on the Follow-up committee can be found in the submission form itself.

List the potential members of the Follow-Up committee and their role.

- ▶ Please list the potential members of Follow-Up Committee marking their involvement in the project.
- ▶ Members may come from national or regional public bodies, EU or international institutions, civil society, the scientific community or the industrial sector.
- ▶ If you have not yet contacted potential members, do not add their names, but write instead 'member 1', 'member 2' etc. However, please do provide the institution they belong to in those cases.

✎ **Note**

- Each project must be accompanied by Follow-Up committee. The objective of this committee is to provide an active follow-up (monitoring) 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.

More information on the Follow-up committee can be found in the submission form itself.

Sections 14.1 – 14.3 are evaluated together. Please assess the following aspects and elaborate your reasoning in the comments:

- *The coherence of the composition of the follow-up committee*
- *The proposed role for the members (informed, consulted, involved)*
- *To the way of working (number of meetings, method of information exchange, etc.), in relation to the foreseen outcome of the project.*
- *The involvement of non-scientific stakeholders/ members in the early stages of the project (co-creation of results) – where appropriate. Consider gender balance.*

Note that it is compulsory that the follow-up committee includes members that are potentially end-users of the results of project.

- The follow-up committee is composed of potential users of the results, such as representatives of public authorities at national, regional, European, or international level, social actors, scientists, industrial actors, etc.
- The members of the follow-up committee are non-funded.
- The final composition of the follow-up committee will be defined in collaboration with BELSPO.

It is sufficient to include a list of potential stakeholders/ members (including a motivation why). You are free to gather (a) letter(s) of intent, but you do not have to include these when submitting the proposal.

14.2. Contribution of each Follow-up Committee member to the project

- ▶ Describe the expected contribution to the project and role of each proposed member.
- ▶ If the actual person is still unknown, please refer to the foreseen institution/organisation.
- ▶ Explain why each proposed member is relevant to the project.
- ▶ In case it is impossible to provide specific persons, please focus on elaborating on the desired composition of the Committee, how this will be achieved & ensured.

14.3. Way of Working of the Follow-up Committee

- ▶ Please describe the way of working of the Follow-up committee.
- ▶ Indicate how the committee will support the project, including advice, validation or feedback.
- ▶ State how often will the committee meet and in which format (online, in-person, hybrid).
- ▶ Describe how information will be shared between the committee and the project team.

Note that the proposal is not scored based on *which people* the project team would like to have in their Follow-up Committee and have listed below. The application is evaluated on relevancy of included stakeholders, its composition (for example: gender diversity), the type of profiles and institutions (and which role they could have), and the way of working of the committee.

Note that Follow-up Committee members are not remunerated.

SECTION D: GENDER & ETHICS

15. Gender

15.1. Gender in the research team(s)

Please (1) explain the gender composition and balance in the project consortium (= Coordinator, Funded Partners and Non-Funded partners, and staff/persons working for the project within their teams), (2) elaborate on how issues related to gender balance & inequality are considered and mitigated and (3) explain how all gender groups within the research team can fairly and equally contribute to the project.

Please consider the following guiding questions:

- ▶ What is the (current) gender composition and balance of the project teams, globally and across leadership and technical roles?
- ▶ How are gender issues considered and what actions are planned to mitigate potential imbalances?
- ▶ How will the research team(s) monitor and adjust their efforts to ensure participation, access and contribution of all team members throughout the project's lifecycle?

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:

- *Is the research team diverse and balanced in terms of gender?*
- *Has the research considered and assessed gender related issues?*
- *Does the proposal include ways to improve the 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?*

► How will all gender groups within the research team contribute fairly and equally to the project as foreseen in the workplan and on their level of expertise, and how will they access and participate in project activities?	
15.2. Gender balance in the Follow-up Committee	
Please explain the gender composition and balance in the Follow-up Committee, and explain how all gender groups within the committee can fairly and equally contribute to the project. Please consider the following guiding questions: ► What is the gender composition and balance of the foreseen follow-up Committee? ► What actions are planned to mitigate potential imbalances? ► How will the project 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?	• <i>Has the composition of the Committee in terms of gender and balance been reflected upon?</i> • <i>What actions are planned to mitigate potential imbalances?</i> • <i>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?</i> • <i>Has the relevance of gender been taken into account in the way of working of the Committee?</i>
15.3. Gender balance in the dissemination / outreach aspects of the project	
Please explain how gender balance is considered in the dissemination and outreach activities of the project. Consider the following guiding questions: ► 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?	Please assess the gender balance in the dissemination & outreach aspects of the projects. • <i>Has gender been sufficiently considered in the outreach & dissemination strategy?</i> • <i>Have potential biases, risks (and opportunities) been identified and sufficiently reflected upon?</i> • <i>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.)?</i> • <i>How will the team(s) ensure the oversight and acting on feedback</i> • <i>If the project proposals state no issues are identified, please assess if their reasoning is sufficient.</i> Dissemination & outreach in general is described in the section 13. Deliverables are listed in section 13 and in the Gantt Chart.
15.4. Gender dimension in the content of the project	
How will you address any potential gender biases & issues related to gender inequality in the content / research & methods of your project? Please explain the gender dimensions in the content of the research project below. Consider intersectionality wherever appropriate. If you have made any comments related to gender & research methods used, in the previous section "methodology", please state this clearly. Please consider the following guiding questions: ► Are human sex and/or gender considerations integrated into the research design, including relevance to the research objectives, methodology, DMP, potential influence on outcomes, and collection and analysis of sex/gender-specific data?	Please assess how the project considers aspects and/or issues related to gender in the proposed research. • <i>If the research involves humans as research subjects, is gender been earnestly considered? Is the relevance of gender to the research topic been analysed?</i> • <i>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?</i> • <i>Are questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, etc. designed to unravel potentially relevant sex and/or gender differences in your data?</i> • <i>Are the groups involved in the project (e.g. samples, testing groups) gender-balanced? And is data analysed according to the sex variable?</i> • <i>Does the proposal explicitly and comprehensively explain how gender issues will be handled?</i>

► If the research involves humans as research subjects, is gender been earnestly considered? Is the relevance of gender to the research topic been analysed? ► Does the methodology ensure that (possible) gender differences will be identified and taken into account? Does the methodology ensure that sex/gender differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research project? ► 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? Is data analysed according to the sex variable? ► Are potentially differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research on different genders been considered? ► Does the proposal explicitly and comprehensively explain how gender issues will be handled? ► What measures are taken to address the identified sex/gender issues in the content of the project? ► Does the project proposal consider how research results might impact sex/gender groups differently?	Have possibly differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research on women and men been considered?
16. Ethics & Research Security	
16.1. Types of Ethical Issues	
► Please select the General Ethic Categories that are relevant for your project. These categories include: 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 issue; ethical issues do not apply to the project. ► The selection of the General Ethic Categories will prompt you to specify the ethical issues in subsequent questions. ► Ticking the boxes marked with (e) requires receiving ethical approval from the competent ethics committee (at the level of your institution or higher) at the latest before initiating any of the research activities concerned.	Sections 16.1 and 16.2 are evaluated together. Please assess the awareness of ethical issues within the proposed project, are all relevant issues identified? Assess 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. If no ethical issues are identified, please assess the reasoning. Please refer to Belgian Code of Conduct for more information. You can find this document on our website.
16.2. Comments on Ethical Issues	
Comment on the ethical issues you marked in the previous question.	
16.3. Ethics declarations	
Read the ethics declarations carefully.	This section does not require evaluation.

SECTION E: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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.
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
• Information File • Evaluation guidelines (this document) • Budget Rules • Scientific ranking of the proposals (from the marks given by individual evaluators) • Submitted project proposals (remotely evaluated), including: - General information - Scientific information (scope, state of the art, research objectives, methodology, research ethics form, gender dimension) - Implementation of the proposal (Gantt chart, work plan description, risk management, Data Management Plan, Coordinator/Partnership, budget table) - Outreach and dissemination (dissemination and follow-up 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
Proposed Project budget versus available Call budget
Coverage in terms of the scope of the Call
Coverage in terms of the scope of the research priorities
Coverage in terms of participation
Coverage in terms of institutions
Critical mass
Coverage in terms of synergy compared to previous financed subjects within the frame of S4Policy (Policy-driven)
Adjustments, recommendations
- Adjustments/recommendations in term of follow-up committee, workplan, ... - Adjustments of budget (either suggested by the remote evaluators or in view of the ensemble of proposals)