PARTNER(S)/PARTNERSHIP	Coordinates of the funded and non-funded project partners (organisations and principle investigators)
PROJECT SUMMARY	**[max. 2 pages]** Briefly describe: - The context and motivation of the project - Expected results and how these will impact Defence - Brief explanation of how the project will be carried out
IN/OUT OF SCOPE	**[1/2 page]** Explain how the project: - answers to the research priorities of the Call (cfr. Sections 2.4., 2.5. and 2.6. of the information document)

DEFRA
DEFENCE-RELATED RESEARCH ACTION

belspo

DEFENSIE
LA DÉFENSE

THEMATIC CALL PULSED DIRECTED ENERGY EFFECTORS
EVALUATION MATRIX PHASE 2 - FULL PROPOSALS

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES	**[2 pages]** Explain the scope of the project and break it down in research objectives, making sure that those are SMART (Specific; Measurable; Accountable; Realistic; Time-related) defined This section should demonstrate: • The relevance of the proposed technology bricks; • The soundness of the underlying approach; • The technical appropriateness and clarity of the chosen microwave or laser emission regime, including its link to the effect mechanism, target interaction, and scalability pathway; • Contribution of the proposed brick(s) to future pulsed microwave and/or pulsed laser effectors, including a credible rationale for the selected temporal operating regime	**1.1. Project objectives** Are the project objectives clear and coherent? Are the project objectives SMART defined?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The research objectives are unclear AND contradictory	The research objectives are badly defined OR do not align with each other	The research objectives are mostly clear and sufficiently aligned	The research objectives are clear and align with each other and they are SMART defined	The research objectives are fully and exceptionnally well described with an outstanding alignment and they are perfectly SMART defined
2. STATE OF THE ART AND INNOVATIVE CHARACTER	**[2 pages]** - Explain the state of current knowledge at national and international level on your topic. Include a list of max. 5 relevant existing publications, projects, references and/or (inter)national networks per project partner to support this. - Provide an overview of the knowledge to be acquired within the project team - Provide an overview of the development of new expertise and competences (new techniques, knowledge, way of working…) in Belgium - Describe the opportunities for (new) national and/or international collaborations.	**2.1. Knowledge of the state of the art.** Does the proposal provide an accurate overview of the state of the art?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal has overlooked the essential scientific state of the art in the domain.	The proposal has important flaws regarding the state of the art.	The proposal demonstrates an average knowledge of the state of the art in the domain, without critical omissions.	The proposal shows a good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are superfluous or minimal.	The proposal shows an exhaustive knowledge of the state of the art in the domain.
	[2 pages] Position your project with regards to the state of the art and explain why your proposal is original and innovative: - in terms of exploring a gap in (inter)national research knowledge - in terms of exploring new methodologies Explain: • why your proposal has added value compared to current state of the art; • how your proposal addresses current technical limitations • the novelty of the subsystem concept, architecture, or validation approach	**2.2. Position of the project with respect to the state of the art (innovativeness)** How is the project positioned in relation to the state of the art?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The objectives of the project fail to address the gap in research or falsely identifies a research gap.	The proposal displays limited added value to the state of the art.	The proposal displays some added value to the state of the art but does not have a pronounced innovative character.	The proposal displays good potential for innovation and displays significant added value relative to the state-of-the-art.	The proposal is highly innovative and unique. It displays outstanding potential for progress beyond the on-going research efforts.
3. RELEVANCE AND POTENTIAL IMPACT FOR DEFENCE	**[1/2 page]** Explain the potential impact of the project (its methodologies, processes, technologies, developments, outcomes, insights, …) and how the project contributes to each of the Defence's R&T strategic objectives as described in the information document (section 1.4.) in terms of: - capability development (a capability being the ability to perform actions to achieve desired objectives/effects, not limited to equipment, but also doctrine, training, ...) - filling of employment gaps and/or job creation - marketable products - optimisation of Defence processes (a process being the series of actions or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end, e.g. procurement process; innovation process ...)	**3.1. Potential impact of the proposal and contribution to defence's R&T strategic objectives** Assess the potential impact of the project and it's contribution to Defence's R&T strategic objectives in terms of: - capability development - filling of employment gaps or job creation - marketable products - optimisation of Defence processes as described in the proposal.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal fails to address the project's impact. It is very doubtful that the project will be able to contribute to Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal fails to address the project's impact. The project's contribution to Defence's R&T strategic objectives is described and correctly linked, but not enough to be clearly relevant	The proposal addresses the project's principal impact. The project will be a relevant contribution to one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal rightly describes the project's impact. The project will be a relevant contribution to more than one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal outstandingly describes the project's impact. The project will be a very relevant contribution to more than one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
	[1 page] Plans to maximise the impact of the project: - Explain the concrete plans of **publications** (number of publications that are expected, target group, target date) valorisation, dissemination, and exploitation of the project results to Defence, in accordance with the WP valorisation and GANTT chart and the expected impact. - Explain the concrete plans of **dissemination** of the project results to Defence, in accordance with the WP valorisation and GANTT chart and the expected impact. Describe the planned measures to maximise the impact of your project by providing a first version of your 'plan for dissemination'. Describe the dissemination and communication measures that are planned, and the target group(s) addressed (e.g. scientific community, end users, financial actors,…). - Outline an **exploitation** plan of your most significant exploitable results including: ° What content could be exploited ° Who will exploit the result output (project partner/if someone else then who and how will they be informed) ° Intellectual property rights strategy if relevant ° Roadmap and goals during and after the project's lifetime (plan of actions to be taken to achieve exploitation) ° Timeframe ° General approach to exploitation - Are there possible follow-on projects for this proposal, either going deeper or with a broader scope? - Describe possible project spin-off effects. - Is there a link with another regional / federal / international project?	**3.2. Plans to maximise the impact of the project (dissemination and valorisation of results)** Assess the capacity of promoting results and knowledge and enabling publication, dissemination and exploitation of data; the adequacy of the targeted audiences, the appropriateness of communication tools and approaches, …	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal offers very poor strategy for valorising and disseminating its results	The proposal outlines valorization and disseminating strategies which contain significant gaps or shortcomings. No efforts are made to promote and distribute results	The valorisation plans are sufficiently described; they allow promoting results and enable publication. The appropriate communication tools and approaches are used, but activities are somewhat limited in terms of approaching different targets	The valorisation plans are well described and offer considerable variety in terms of dissemination activities for different targets, using original communication tools and approaches leading to a good transfer and/or utilization of results	The valorisation plans are fully described and offer an original and ambitious strategy to captivate its targets and generate high interest about its results. There is a link with another regional / federal / international project, or ambition for follow-on (deeper or broader) projects based on its findings
	[1/2 page] Regulatory and safety aspects Explain how your proposal addresses regulatory, spectrum, and emission compliance considerations. Address as well the safety, containment, and system protection measures.	**3.3. Regulatory and safety aspects** Assess the capacity to addresses regulatory, spectrum, and emission compliance considerations, as well the safety, containment, and system protection measures.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal does not take into account important regulatory and safety aspects	The proposal is generally aware of the relevant regulatory and safety aspects but fails to address them.	The proposal is aware of the relevant regulatory and safety aspects and addresses them in a superfluous manner.	The proposal is aware of the relevant regulatory and safety aspects, and addresses them in a professional way.	The proposal is very well aware of the relevant regulatory and safety aspects addresses them an an excellent and pro-active manner.
	A Data Management Plan (DMP) (separate file) is a key element of good data management. The proposal must clearly indicate what data the project will generate, when and in what format the data will be made accessible and how it will be curated and preserved, specifying which categories of users are likely to benefit from access to the data.	**3.4. Data management plan and availability of generated data after the research is finalised (separate file)** Assess the quality of the data management plan and the availability of the generated data for Defence	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal has no plan to make the data available after the research is finalised	The data management plan containing significant shortcomings or gaps	The data management plan follows basic standards in making the generated data available	The data management plan follows good standards, making the data easily available	There is an excellent data management plan in line with the highest standards to enable easy re-use of the data
	Research ethics evaluation (separate file)	**3.5. All projects must perform an evaluation of the ethical aspects of the research that will be undertaken.**	This part of the proposal will **not be evaluated by the remote evaluators nor by the Scientific Experts Committee**. The Ethical Advisory Board of the RHID will assess this information and can advise the partnership how to deal with the ethical aspects of its proposal and formulate concerns, advice, preventive and/or corrective measures for specific ethical aspects.					
4. QUALITY OF THE FUNDED PARTNER(S)/PARTNERSHIP	**[Part 1 of 3 - 2 pages per partner]** [Research institutes (public or private non-profit)] Provide a description of expertise and skills for each partner: - Their professional background - Maximum 5 top publications relevant for the proposal (indicate clearly the international peer reviewed publications) - A list of the research projects carried out over the past five years in the topic of the call or related areas (specify the duration of the work and funding source). - A list of their (inter)national contacts and the (inter)national networks to which they belong within the context of the proposal. - The scientific quality, management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator. - If possible, include web links for all the information above.	**4.1. [Research institutes (public or private non-profit)] Individual quality of the partner(s)** Assess the quality of the individual partners within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be taken into account, including management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partner(s) do(es) not possess the experience and expertise to perform the proposed research	The partner(s) cannot be considered als (a) reliable and promissing partner(s) for the project due to insufficient research experience or expertise to contribute in a suitable way	The partner(s) possess(es) enough experience and expertise to perform the research in a suitable way	The partner(s) is an/are acknowledged expert(s) in their fields, who can perform the research competently	The partner(s) is/are well established in their research field and can be considered to be highly reliable, competent and fit perfectly for this project
	[Part 2 of 3 - 2 pages per partner] [Private companies] Provide a description of expertise and skills for each partner: - Their active production / research activities in Belgium - A list of the products / prototypes / research projects they actively contributed to over the past five years in the topic of the call or related areas. - A list of their (inter)national contacts and the (inter)national networks to which they belong within the context of the proposal. - A list of their Defence customers - The management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator. - If possible, include web links for all the information above.	**4.2. [Private companies] Individual quality of the partner(s)** Assess the quality of the individual partners within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be taken into account, including management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partner(s) do(es) not possess the required experience or expertise to perform the project tasks	The partner(s) cannot be considered als (a) reliable and promissing partner(s) for the project due to insufficient experience or expertise to contribute in a suitable way	The partner(s) possess(es) enough experience and expertise to perform the project tasks in a suitable way.	The partner(s) is an/are acknowledged expert(s) in their fields, who can perform the project tasks competently	The partner(s) is/are well established in their field of activities and can be considered to be highly reliable, competent and fit perfectly for this project

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
	[Part 3 of 3 - 1 page] (if applicable) Argument the motivation of choosing this partnership in addressing the topic of the proposal. The different dimensions of the added value in a partnership can be seen as (non-exhaustive list): - Well-balanced partnership - Complementarity of expertise among partners - Complementarity of disciplines and way of working (multi, inter) to properly cover the project objectives - Long term perspective on collaboration: can this project be the starting point for a broadened or intensified collaboration?	**4.3. Adequacy and added value of the proposed partnership in addressing the topic** Assess the adequacy of the partnership as reasoned by the applicants in relation to the project objectives	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partnership fails to address the different network dimensions (like balanced partnership, complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership has not taken into account essential network dimensions (like balanced partnership, complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership is sufficiently balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including balanced partnership, complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution), for the project to be feasible	The partnership is well balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including balanced partnership, complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution), bringing an added value to the proposal	The partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of all the different dimensions (including balanced partnership, complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution) , bringing a high added value to the proposal
5. COHERENCE BETWEEN RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	**[5 pages]** Methodology Translate your research objectives into a methodology (used methods, techniques, systems and/or way of working) in order to achieve the results: - the division of the project into phases - the organisation of the project team - the technologies used - detail the results your approach will enable to gather (expected outcomes): - take possible ethical issues into account if relevant Explain what measures you take to reduce critical integration risks in later development phases. What are the proposed pathways toward a hard-kill effect, including the relevance of the selected technology to irreversible damage or disablement.	**5.1. Methodology** Assess the chosen methodology (taking into account the different disciplines mobilised), use of data, the articulation of the objectives-methodology-expected outcomes.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The methodology and use of data are unclear or inappropriate.	The methodology and use of data have shortcomings and/or lacks details.	The methodology and use of data are sufficient. The objectives, methodology and expected outcomes form a coherent and reasonable unit, but contain some gaps or shortcomings	The methodology and use of data are elaborate, well matched to the objectives and expected outcomes. There is room for minor improvement	The methodology and use of data are outstanding and it ensures a perfect match to the objectives and outcomes, and leaves little to no room for improvement
6. ADEQUACY OF THE WORK PLAN AND EFFICIENCY	**[1/2 page per WP]** Please provide a description of the project in terms of work packages, tasks, and deliverables in accordance with the GANTT chart. Refer to: - Number and title of Work Package, Work Package leader (financed, non-financed) - Number, title and timing of tasks, task leader, participants to the task (financed, non-financed, subcontractors…) - Timing of deliverables - Number of person-months for each task - Means, tools, procedures, techniques to carry out the tasks Notes: - The work plan must be detailed to the level of work packages (WP) and tasks (Tasks). The definition of subtasks is not possible. - You may add as many WP, Tasks and Deliverables as required by the project. It is not mandatory to have a Deliverable for each task. - Work packages or tasks necessary for the implementation of the project but not financed by Defence must also be described and added to the GANTT chart. Compulsory work packages: • Coordination, project management and reporting • Data management • Valorisation / Dissemination / Exploitation	**6.1. Relation of the work packages to the proposal objectives** Notwithstanding work intensity and duration of tasks and WP, assess the way the breakdown of the work plan in work packages and tasks enables the realisation of the project.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal does not provide a clear work plan, hampering the realization of the project	The work plan raises doubts on the successful implementation of several aspects of the project	The work plan sufficiently enables to apprehend the objectives of the project, leaving room for improvement (shortcomings and/or redundancies are present)	The work plan correctly enables to apprehend the objectives of the project leaving some room for improvement (minor shortcomings and/or redundancies are present)	The work plan outstandingly enables to apprehend all the objectives of the project with neither redundancies nor shortcomings
	GANTT chart (separate file) Work planning and time schedule Complete the GANTT chart in accordance with the description of the detailed work plan, tasks and deliverables above: - Work intensity of each partner within each task (expressed in person-month [PM]) - Include for each partner the person-months funded by the project and the person-months funded by other sources (see notes). Make sure that these data correspond with the data filled in the budget file. Notes: - Partners include: financed, non-financed and subcontractors. - 1 Person-month [PM] = 1 full-time equivalent [FTE] or 2 half-time equivalents over 1 month… - Other sources of financing may include: salary payment by institutions other than Defence and/or via other projects, voluntary contributions… If a given task requires 7 person-months, and 6 months will be financed by the project, the 7th month must appear under 'other sources of financing'. Compulsory work packages: • Coordination, project management and reporting • Data management • Valorisation / Dissemination / Exploitation	**6.2. Work planning of the tasks** (consult the GANTT chart, filled out by the applicants) Is the work planning (time schedule, duration and person-power effort per task) appropriate and feasible to run the project? (**horizontal lecture of the GANTT chart**, not going into detail for each partner, with recommendations regarding the length and pertinence of the activities within the calendar).	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The work planning is not feasible to appropriately run the project	The work planning is not sufficiently adequate or sufficiently elaborated. Structural improvements are needed	The work planning is elaborated in a reasonable way, but contains some gaps or shortcomings and leaves room for improvement	The work planning is elaborated in a well-thought manner, allowing for minor improvements regarding efficiency, integration and synergy within the tasks	The work planning is elaborated in an efficient and cost effective way, clearly focused on reaching a high level of integration and synergy within the tasks

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
	GANTT chart (separate file) Workload intensity in relation to the work packages Based on the GANTT chart, provide an overall assessment of the requested level of person-power of each partner throughout the work packages and tasks (Vertical lecture of the GANTT chart, with recommendations regarding the intensity of their activities and pertinence of participation in them).	**6.3. Workload intensity in relation to the work packages** (consult the GANTT chart, filled out by the applicants) Provide an overall assessment of the requested level of person-power of each partner throughout the work packages and tasks (**vertical lecture of the GANTT chart**, with recommendations regarding the intensity of their activities and pertinence of participation in them).	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	There is an inacceptable discrepancy between the workload and the investment (person-power) of the partners	The work repartition among partners is not sufficiently justified by the tasks; the requested level of person-power calls for major adjustments	There is a reasonable work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power calls for some adjustments	There is a more than appropriate work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power may call for minor adjustments	All partners have very fine-tuned, pertinent and cost-effective work efforts throughout work packages and tasks
	Risk assessment: Number, identify and explain the main incurring risks that could delay or hinder the project and the contingency plans / mitigating measures foreseen to deal with them using the risk management form. Locate the number of each risk in terms of its likelihood of occurrence and impact on the project Detailed contingency measures need to be provided for each risk of category "medium high" and "severe".	**6.4. Risk assessment of the project** How well are the risks evaluated by the applicants? Do they provide an adequate 'fall-back' plan, if needed?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal does not provide a clear view of possible major risks and/or feasible contingency plans	Important risks are overlooked and/or contingency plans are not sufficiently realistic	Adequate assessment of the major risks and reasonable contingency plans	Exhaustive assessment of the risks and good preventive contingency plans	Outstanding assessment of the risks and excellent preventive outline of solutions and alternatives
	Detailed budget BUDGET TABLE (separate file) - The information document contains a more detailed explanation regarding the budget rules: see information document (section 3.7.). Please provide the following budget information in the separate budget file: - Staff costs - General operating costs - Specific operating costs - Overheads - Equipment costs - Subcontracting costs	**6.5. Budget assessment** Is the budget realistic, well-balanced among partners (if applicable), and in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The budget severely overestimates or underestimates fundamental needs of the project, and/or is not in line with its objectives and/or expected outcomes	The budget partially overestimates or underestimates fundamental needs of the project, and/or is not well aligned with its objectives and/or expected outcomes	The budget correctly estimates the fundamental needs of the project, leaving some room for adjustments; it is adequately aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget correctly estimates all the needs of the project, only leaving room for very minor adjustments; it is very well aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget is extremely well-thought and optimized. It perfectly estimates all the needs of the project and takes into account the post-project. It perfectly aligns with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project

WEIGHT OF THE DIFFERENT CRITERIA	ALL THEMES	criteria ranges involved (individual weights TBD)
Scientific quality	35%	* project objectives * knowledge of SOA & innovative character * coherence between research objectives and methodology * adequacy of the work plan & efficiency -> risk Mgt
Quality and efficiency of the implementation	40%	* relevance & potential impact for Defence -> Data Mgt Plan * quality of the partner(s)/partnership * adequacy of the work plan & efficiency -> all except risk Mgt
Impact maximisation strategy	25%	*relevance for Defence & potential impact -> all except Data Mgt Plan & research ethics evaluation