I. Scientific quality				
A. Candidate + consortium	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Scientific knowledge and coaching				
	☐ Manifest gaps and shortcomings in the knowledge of the state-of-the-art, **or** ☐ The guidance and mentoring provided are judged inadequate.	☐ Fair but incomplete knowledge of the state-of-the-art; this does not pose any risk for the implementation of the project, **or** ☐ The guidance and mentoring for the implementation of the project is reasonable (additional attention is needed to guide the candidate).	☐ Very good knowledge of the state-of-the-art within own field of research, **and** ☐ The guidance and mentoring for the execution of the project is adequate.	<u>Requirements good</u> + ☐ Very good knowledge of the state-of-the-art, even outside own field of research.
2. Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset				
	☐ Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor, **or** ☐ He/she is unfamiliar with the topic of the project. Insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, **or** ☐ Poor motivation, not based on a fundamental interest in the proposed project.	☐ Moderate reasoning skills or critical mindset, **or** ☐ Moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, **or** ☐ Moderate motivation.	☐ Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good; can present new concepts based on well-founded arguments; **and** ☐ He/she has a good insight in the proposed approach and techniques; **and** ☐ Convincing and motivated candidate.	☐ Very good reasoning, very good critical-scientific mindset; can present new concepts in a very sound manner; **and** ☐ He/she has an excellent insight in the proposed approach and techniques; candidate knows exactly what he/she will do and why; **and** ☐ Very convincing and motivated candidate; he/she is the driving force behind this project.

B. Project	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1. Scientific quality level and challenges (including clarity innovation goal)				
	☐ The proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the international state-of-the-art, **or** ☐ The innovation goal is completely unclear, **or**	☐ The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art is acceptable, **or** ☐ The innovation goal is acceptable, but shows important shortcomings in terms of clarity and verifiability.	☐ The project builds upon and extends the international state-of-the-art, can be qualified as basic research of high quality, including a good level of risks, challenges and inventiveness, **and** ☐ The innovation goal is clear, to the point and verifiable.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The proposal is highly innovative and unique, and offers a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art ("pioneer project"); the proposal demonstrates a very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, concepts and strategies.
2. Quality of the research approach and feasibility				
	☐ The research approach and the project planning display serious flaws and shortcomings, **or** ☐ There is a mismatch between the research goals and the research approach, **or** ☐ Crucial challenges are not identified, **or** ☐ The feasibility is low, **or** the scientific project goals are expressed in an insufficiently clear manner to allow an assessment of their feasibility within the project.	☐ Research approach and planning are reasonable, but contain some shortcomings, **or** ☐ The research approach offers only a limited contribution towards the scientific goals (or insufficient focus on the crucial aspects), **or** ☐ Not all challenges have been identified; this has a clear impact on the attainment of the scientific goals, **or** ☐ The feasibility is not realistic, but it is likely that the scientific goals will be partially reached.	☐ The research approach is well suited for reaching the research objectives; risks were identified and the research planning is clear, **and** ☐ The project as planned is feasible within the timeframe of the project.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The research approach includes a thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.

II. Valorization				
A. Candidate + consortium	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Insight in the strategic importance of the project and valorization				
	☐ Limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Limited knowledge of the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results.	☐ Rather limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Rather limited knowledge of the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Rather limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results.	☐ Good insight in the strategic importance of the project, and the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results, **and** ☐ Good knowledge of the market potential and the valorization path.	☐ Very good insight in the strategic importance of the project, and the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results, **and** ☐ Very good knowledge of the market potential and the valorization path.
2. Commitment for valorization (including cooperation with industry/industrial mentor)				
	☐ The candidate shows no motivation to interact with the industry/industrial mentor or to develop complementary skills to bring the results into practice.	☐ The commitment of the candidate is moderate to pay enough attention to the applicability of the results and to interact actively with the industry/industrial mentor.	☐ The candidate is clearly motivated to pay attention to the applicability of the scientific results and to interact actively with the industry/industrial mentor; there is a clear personal commitment of the candidate to develop skills in this matter.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The research group has a good track record with regard to transfer and/or actual utilization or follow-up R&D-projects funded by industry.

B. Project	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1. Strategic importance of the project for the company				
	□ The strategic importance of the project for the company is unclear, **or** □ It is clear that no interactions have taken place or are being planned between the candidate and the industrial mentor.	□ The strategic importance of the project for the company has been estimated too optimistically, **or** □ Certain gaps and shortcomings are present in the description of the potential applications for the company, but their presence can be expected, **or** □ Limited interactions have taken place or are being planned between the candidate and the industrial mentor.	□ The project has a clear impact on the valorization and the scientific results can have a clear added value for the company, **and** □ The proposal shows that there has been a good interaction with the company and also during the project execution sufficient interactions are planned.	<u>Requirements good +</u> □ The project can result in an important diversification for the company, or in a new technology platform with many potential applications, **or** □ During the project execution a substantial amount of time is spent by the candidate in the company.
2. Size and probability of the expected valorization (in case of scientific success)				
	□ The valorization potential for the company has not been described, **or** □ Very limited realistic market expectations, or the company will lack the required capabilities for valorization, **or** □ Unclear/uncertain which parts of the value chain are located in Flanders, or whether there will be sufficient valorization in Flanders, **or** □ Substantial risk factors are evident, the impact on the valorization potential is not tackled sufficiently in the project proposal, or the bottlenecks are difficult to resolve.	□ The potential for the company is only summarily described, **or** □ Shrinking market, or market outlook unclear, or the competition has significantly more comparative advantages, **or** □ Limited parts of the expected value chain are located in Flanders, **or** □ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors are only partially discussed in the proposal, but may be manageable.	□ A good potential for the company is demonstrated, **and** □ The company has a good competitive position in the expected valorization process, **and** □ Important parts of the value chain are located in Flanders, **and** □ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors have been proactively analyzed in the proposal, and are almost absent or manageable.	□ The targeted valorization for the company is realistic, extensive and thoroughly substantiated, **and** □ The company has significant comparative advantages in the target market, **and** □ The value chain will principally be located in Flanders, **and** □ Strong starting position for IPR, including “freedom to operate”, essential for the valorization chances.