

# Defence-related Research Action - DEFRA

## Call for proposals 2024

### ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR POTENTIAL REMOTE EVALUATORS

#### FOREWORD

This document contains the eligibility criteria for potential remote evaluators of the peer review.

Potential reviewers must have appropriate expertise – demonstrable through their present or past function and affiliation or scientific achievements such as peer-reviewed scientific publications or previous presence in expert panels or committees - in the research area(s) covered by the proposal(s).

#### *Brief recall of the DEFRA evaluation procedure*

DEFRA's phase 2 evaluation procedure of Full Proposals consists of 4 steps (see section 5.1.2. of the Information document):

- Step 1: Remote scientific peer review evaluation
  - Remote individual written evaluation
  - Production of Consensus Report
- Step 2: Scientific Experts Committee (SEC) evaluation, including interviews with the applicants
- Step 3: Selection proposal formulated by the Scientific Committee of the RHID
- Step 4: Final selection of proposals by Directors Board of the RHID

The selected experts will participate in the individual written evaluation (i.e. step 1 of the evaluation procedure).

For more information concerning this procedure, please check the **Information document including submission and evaluation guidelines and budget rules** on the DEFRA website:

<https://www.belspo.be/defra/>

The experts must meet the following criteria:

- Be outstanding and (inter)nationally (well) recognised in their research field (min 5 peer-reviewed publications in the given research field)
- Be able to evaluate all the aspects covered by the proposal
- Be external experts (not belonging to Belgian Defence)
- Be free of conflict of interest

Experts who fail to comply with all criteria will not be considered.

### ***Regarding Conflict of interest***

Experts are considered to have a conflict of interest if they stand to profit professionally, financially or personally from approval or rejection of an application.

More specifically, this means eligible experts must:

- have no direct link with the project;
- not be involved in the preparation of the pre-proposal and/or the full proposal;
- not directly benefit from the acceptance of the proposal;
- not be a family member or partner relative to the first degree of any of the applicants;
- not belong to applicants' institutions/companies;
- not be a director, a trustee or a partner of the applicants' institutions/companies;
- not have been employed within the applicants' institutions/companies in the past 5 years;
- not have held a contract or collaborated in any way with any of the applicants or their research groups in the past 5 years;
- not be a(n) (ex) PhD-promotor (one of the) of (the) applicants;
- have no common projects or co-publications with any of the applicants or their research groups within the last 5 years;
- not be in any other situation which compromises or casts a doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.