PROJECT SUMMARY **(in file "Summary, keywords, partners")**	**[1/2 page]** 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 Include keywords
PARTNER/PARTNERSHIP **(in file "Summary, keywords, partners")**	Coordinates of the funded and non-funded project partners (organisations and principal investigators)
PROJECT SCOPE **(in pre-proposal description)**	**[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 1 - PRE-PROPOSALS

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES	**[1/2 page]** Explain the scope of the project and break it down in major research objectives, making sure that those are SMART (Specific; Measurable; Accountable; Realistic; Time-related) defined	**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. INNOVATION WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE OF THE ART	**[1/2 page]** Briefly explain the state of current knowledge at national and international level on your topic.	**2.1. Knowledge of the state of the art.** Does the proposal provide a realistic overview of the current 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.
	[1/2 page] Briefly explain how your proposal is original and innovative with respect to the current state of the art. The study should allow to solve a problem that has not yet been researched or to solve a problem using a methodology that has not yet been researched. It may also be the continuation of an innovative study which has produced concrete results but which need to be followed up. Under no circumstances may it duplicate a research study carried out in another regional / federal / international framework (international: e.g. NATO, EDA, EDF). It may, however, contribute to a larger project within that other framework.	**2.2. Innovativeness** How original and innovative is the project with respect to the current 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. There is development of new expertise or competences in Belgium
3. RELEVANCE AND POTENTIAL IMPACT FOR DEFENCE	**[3/4 page]** Explain the relevance and potential impact of the project (e.g. its methodologies, processes, technologies, developments, outcomes, insights, …) for Belgian Defence, in relation to the expected impact for your theme (cfr. information document sections 2.5. and 2.6.).	**3.1 Potential impact of the proposal in light of the expected outcomes** Assess the potential impact as described in the proposal	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal fails to target the impact domains and/or its significance	The proposal fails to acknowledge the principal impact domains and its significance	The proposal acknowledges the principal impact domains and its significance	The proposal rightly evaluates the targeted impact and its significance	The proposal outstandingly evaluates targeted impact and its significance
4. QUALITY OF THE FUNDED PARTNERS/PARTNERSHIP (note that a partnership is not required for this thematic call)	**[Part 1 of 3 - 1/2 page per partner]** [Research institutes (public or private non-profit)] Provide a short description of expertise and skills for each partner: - Relevant publications and/or products, services, achievements over the past five years - Relevant previous projects and/or activities (ongoing or finished) over the past five years - Relevant infrastructure / equipment that can be used for the project - For the coordinator: references of proven experience specifically related to the tasks of the coordinator (cfr. information document, section 3.5.).	**4.1 [Research institutes (public or private non-profit] Individual quality of the partners** 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 the relevant skills of the coordinator.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partners do not possess the experience and expertise to perform the proposed research	The partners are poorly equipped for the proposed research due to insufficient experience and expertise	The partners possess reasonable experience and expertise to perform the research in a suitable manner	The partners are acknowledged experts in their fields, who can perform the research competently	The partners are pioneers or established authorities in their field, whose involvement will elevate the value of the outcome
	[Part 2 of 3 - 1/2 page per partner] [Private companies] Provide a short description of expertise and skills for each partner: - Relevant active production / research activities in Belgium - Relevant products / prototypes / research projects (ongoing or finished over the past five years) - Relevant Infrastructure / equipment that can be used for the project - List of defence customers (countries) over the past five years for the described product range - For the coordinator: references of proven experience specifically related to the tasks of the coordinator (cfr. information document, section 3.5.).	**4.2 [Private companies] Individual quality of the partners** 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 the relevant skills of the coordinator.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partners do not possess the required experience, expertise or financial health to contribute to the project	The partners are little credible for the project due to insufficient experience, expertise or	The partners possess reasonable experience and expertise to contribute to the project in a suitable manner.	Based on their Defence customers, their contacts, the projects they recently participated to in the field in consideration, the partners are acknowledged industry in their fields, who can contribute competently to this project.	Based on their Defence customers, their contacts, the projects they recently participated to in the field in consideration, the partners are highly reliable and competent and fit perfectly for this project.

			Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
	[Part 3 of 3 - 1/3 page] If applicable, briefly explain the added value of the partnership in addressing the topic of the proposal, such as the complementarity between the partners in order to achieve the project objectives.	**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 (if applicable)	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partnership fails to address the different network dimensions (like TH, complementarity of expertise and way of working), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership has not taken into account essential network dimensions (like TH, complementarity of expertise and way of working), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership is sufficiently balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including TH, complementarity of expertise and way of working), for the project to be feasible. All 3 entities of the triple helix are represented (RHID as government).	The partnership is well balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including TH, complementarity of expertise and way of working), bringing an added value to the proposal. All 3 entities of the triple helix are represented (RHID as government).	The partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of all the different dimensions (including TH, complementarity of expertise and way of working) , bringing a high added value to the proposal. All 3 entities of the triple helix are represented (RHID as government).
WEIGHT OF THE DIFFERENT CRITERIA	BOTH THEMES	CRITERIA RANGES INVOLVED						
Quality of the pre-proposal	40%	* Project Objectives * Innovation with respect to the SOA						
Quality of the partners & adequacy of the partnership	30%	* Quality of the funded Partner(s) (Partnership)						
Impact	30%	* Relevance and Potential Impact for Defence						