

## Score grid for SBO projects with an economic finality – version January 2019

### Scientific dimension (S)

Scientific dimension S	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Weak	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
S1.1 Scientific added value relative to the international state of the art and ongoing research activities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal contains structural flaws or does <u>not</u> offer a scientific added value relative to the international state-of-the-art and to already ongoing research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research at the international level is limited.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal shows the characteristics of a catching-up effort relative to the international state-of-the-art.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research at the international level is still reasonable but less pronounced or less well elaborated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The scientific goals of the proposal offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing strategic research activities. The project builds upon the international state-of-the-art in a sound manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is highly innovative and very unique. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from the ongoing strategic research efforts at the international level ("pioneering project").</li> </ul>
S1.2 Quality of the strategic basic research in terms of its high-risk/high-gain characteristics, its challenges and inventiveness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project barely qualifies as high-risk/high-gain research or carrying out the project almost does not involve real scientific challenges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal shows a rather limited level of challenges and its high-risk/high-gain nature is on the low side.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> An important part of the proposal fits less well with the requirements of high-risk/high-gain, challenging and inventive basic research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal can be qualified as basic research of high scientific quality. Its high-risk/high-gain characteristics, challenges and inventiveness are well-balanced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal demonstrates a very clear high-risk/high-gain profile and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, concepts and strategies.</li> </ul>
S1.3 Intrinsic scientific feasibility of the project goals ( <b>assuming that the project is well conducted and managed</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reaching the scientific project goals is evaluated as not feasible within the project boundaries (even provided that the project is well conducted and managed).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reaching the scientific goals is not considered a challenge, <i>given the absence of high-risk/high-gain basic research and challenges (as assessed in criterion S1.2).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The scientific project goals are formulated in an insufficiently clear manner to allow an assessment of their intrinsic feasibility within the project.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project offers only a marginal or limited contribution towards the ultimate attainment of the stated scientific goals.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project goals as such is good, <i>but the project proposal is characterized by a rather limited high-risk/high-gain profile and limited challenges (as assessed in criterion S1.2).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project goals is reasonable <i>for a project that fits well with the requirements of high-risk/high-gain basic research, possessing a good level of challenges (as assessed in criterion S1.2).</i> It is likely that the scientific goals will be partly reached.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project goals is good, <i>but an important part of the proposal fits less well with the requirements of high-risk/high-gain, challenging and inventive basic research (as assessed in criterion S1.2).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project goals is good <i>for a project that is characterized by high-risk/high-gain research and that possesses a good level of challenges (as assessed in criterion S1.2).</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>No scoring possibility</b></p>
S2.1 Quality of the research approach		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a discrepancy or mismatch between the research goals and the research approach.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is characterised by serious flaws or shortcomings. Structural adjustments to the research approach are needed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The matching between the research goals and the chosen approach needs to be substantially improved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings and/or leaves room for improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realization of the strategic research objectives. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings.</li> </ul>	<p>All requirements for a "positive" score are fully met.</p> <p><u>And in addition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the research approach also includes a thorough identification of the research risks and a carefully designed prioritisation of alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.</li> </ul>

Scientific dimension S	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Weak	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
S2.2 Quality project planning + management		<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal does not provide a clear project planning and a clear project management.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project planning and project management is not sufficiently adequate or not sufficiently elaborated. Structural improvements are needed. <input type="checkbox"/> The allocation of tasks and the partner's interactions exhibit serious flaws or shortcomings or have an excessive overlap.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project planning and project management is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings and leaves room for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> For a significant part of the project or for some research aspects, there is a mismatch, overlap or vagueness with regard to allocation of research tasks among the consortium partners and their mutual interactions. <input type="checkbox"/> For a significant part of the project, the individual research partners work in relative separation from each other instead of building a common integrated knowledge base.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project planning and project management processes are elaborated in a clear and professional manner. The allocation of research tasks among the consortium partners and their mutual interactions are clear and appropriate. The proposal contains clear objectives, performance levels, milestones and deliverables on the basis of which the progress of the strategic research can be monitored.	All requirements for a "positive" score are fully met, <u>And in addition:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> The research plan is clearly focused on reaching a high level of integration and synergy during the project execution, and, <input type="checkbox"/> The project description provides evidence for the use of well elaborated and comprehensive project management tools supporting project conceptualizing, execution, monitoring and (re)scheduling. It uses state of art project management software allowing for the follow-up of interdependent activities, time registration, etc.
S3.1 Input-output balance (i.e. balance between research workload and requested level of personpower and resources)		<input type="checkbox"/> There is a substantial mismatch between the research workload and the requested level of personpower and resources. The appropriate adjustment amounts to more than 50% of the requested budget.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an important unbalance between the research workload and the requested level of personpower and resources. The appropriate adjustment amounts to 33% to 50% of the requested budget. <input type="checkbox"/> Only if applicable: The heavy research equipment and major sub-contracting are less essential for the project or require a budget adjustment between 33% to 50%.	<input type="checkbox"/> The level of personpower and resources is acceptable provided that the project budget is moderately adjusted (i.e. between 20% and 33% relative to the application). <input type="checkbox"/> Only if applicable: The heavy research equipment and major sub-contracting are evaluated as needed and acceptable provided that the budget is moderately adjusted (i.e. between 20% and 33%) or financed (entirely or in part) through the standard allowances for working expenses.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a good balance between the research workload and the requested level of personpower and resources. Potential adjustments are less than 20% of the project budget.  <b>AND</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Only if applicable: The heavy research equipment and major sub-contracting are well motivated and essential to carry out the research project in an efficient manner. Potential budget adjustments are less than 20% of the equipment or subcontracting budget.	<b>No scoring possibility</b>
S4.1 R&D capacity and competence; infrastructure		<input type="checkbox"/> Essential research expertise or infrastructure is lacking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Important modifications are needed to the composition of the consortium and/or to the research infrastructure in order to carry out the research project.	<input type="checkbox"/> The overall expertise or infrastructure of the consortium is reasonable but there are some particular concerns or shortcomings to allow the optimal execution of the project. The available integration of the research expertise in the consortium leaves some room for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> The available research competence and infrastructure is very good and the synergy within the consortium is sufficient.  <b>OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> The available research competence and infrastructure is sufficient and the synergy within the consortium is well pronounced.	<input type="checkbox"/> The available research competence and infrastructure is very good. Key partners of the consortium are "top level" research performers in the international context (at least recognised as "leaders" at the European level).  <u>And in addition:</u> <input type="checkbox"/> The synergy between the consortium partners is also very pronounced. The proposal involves a meaningful and needed research cooperation which exceeds the boundaries of a single university or research institution.

## Utilisation dimension (U)\*

Utilisation dimension U	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Poor	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
U1.1 Potential applications		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Virtually no applications or exclusivity to one company.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The application potential is insufficiently substantiated or inadequate.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The intended application is not clear or of little economic relevance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The application potential is real, but rather restricted to a limited number of companies within a single industry.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project offers substantive applications, but with a relatively low probability.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project responds to a demand expressed by a number of companies, but with a less pronounced strategic interest, or the project is targeted to a problem with real but limited economic applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project offers a strategic added value for a number of industrial activities or has sufficient innovation potential so that, if successful, it will almost certainly be translated into a number of applications of sufficient size. The description is rather generic with limited substantiation.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project effectively responds to a demand of strategic economic importance for a group of companies. Connects with the activities of this group of companies. Has sufficient innovation potential so that, if successful, it will almost certainly be translated into a number of applications of sufficient size.</li> </ul>	<p>Such as reasonable +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> thoroughly substantiated and large-scale utilisation is to be expected</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> it is very clear what delta can be created with the companies</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> if successful, it will move these companies into higher gear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project offers a range of applications with a clear strategic added value for a large group of companies or a breakthrough value of a disruptive nature, so that a substantial utilisation is to be expected for a large group of companies, with multiple utilisation paths in various companies as well as a multiplier effect.</li> </ul> <p>Such as positive +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project objective responds to a demand that is strategically important for a large group of companies</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> with a potential for a very large utilisation</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> across companies with different activities.</li> </ul>
U1.2 Strategic importance (= relevance) of the research approach for applications		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposed approach will not result in utilisation.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a mismatch between the project execution and the utilisation objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project approach is only partially relevant for the anticipated utilisation. Either the contents of the proposal is not the optimal path to reach the intended utilisation opportunities or only a part of the project is relevant for the intended applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The research approach offers a relevant strategic added value for the realisation of the intended applications. A number of additional objectives may not really be required, but their number is limited.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project goes fairly far in the R&amp;D process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The right approach to achieve the intended applications. No superfluous sub-aspects.</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The deliverable(s) of the proposal fall in the direct R&amp;D horizon of at least one of the stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<p>Such as positive <b>and</b> in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project approach is the best conceivable approach to achieve the desired valorisation. The intended applications are clearly the driving force behind the implementation approach. Furthermore, the approach is highly cost-effective.</li> </ul>
U1.3 R&D prospects and utilization commitment of stakeholders after completion of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Focussed only knowledge creation without any prospect for follow-up R&amp;D with an economic finality.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Results can be directly commercialised.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A major portion of the project virtually coincides with the normal research horizon of companies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There are some gaps or weaknesses in the description of the follow-up path, but further R&amp;D activities are to be expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A good potential is demonstrated for follow-up R&amp;D projects to be undertaken by or in collaboration with economic stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a commitment of the stakeholders that will participate in the follow-up projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a commitment of the stakeholders that will participate in the follow-up projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The follow-up projects are very well defined, with input from the stakeholders that are likely to participate in the follow-up projects.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No scoring possibility</b></p>

Utilisation dimension U	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Poor	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
U1.4 Strategic added value for Flanders		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Few prospects for utilisation in Flanders: utilisation is <u>primarily</u> focussed on non-Flemish users.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Potential utilisation in Flanders is inherently limited in scope.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal exhibits certain shortcomings in the development of the utilisation potential for Flanders, but the potential is likely to be realised.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The targeted utilisation in Flanders is feasible and substantiated, but major parts of the utilisation value chain are located outside of Flanders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Criterion U1.1 is at the least reasonable and the targeted utilisation in Flanders is realistic and extensive and thoroughly substantiated. The main parts of the expected utilisation value chain are located in Flanders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The targeted utilisation is realistic and comprehensive with a very strong and thoroughly substantiated contribution to the future competitiveness of the Flemish region.</li> </ul>
U2.1 Vision and approach to utilisation (including bottlenecks)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The utilisation plan is insufficiently elaborated and substantiated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The vision and approach to utilisation exhibits shortcomings. Structural changes to the utilisation approach are needed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The chosen utilisation approach is less optimal for certain aspects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal includes a well-argued vision and approach to utilisation with an elaborated utilisation plan. A limited number of utilisation aspects are insufficiently substantiated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A reasoned vision for all utilisation aspects (e.g., based on a SWOT analysis and the like) <b>AND</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Relevant contribution by a person designated for utilisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such as positive +</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> All bottlenecks and obstacles have been discussed and there is a clear strategy for dealing with them (e.g., fall back scenarios).</li> </ul>
U2.2 Feasibility utilisation approach (through interaction with existing users or through new spin-off)	<i>for spin-off creation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There are important points of attention regarding the relevance of the users involved and/or regarding the proper alignment between the results and the profile of the users involved.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The business concept is poorly elaborated.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The specific utility and the economic relevance of the results is not well demonstrated and elaborated for all of the members.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is concern over the involvement and interaction dynamic of the advisory committee.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The business concept is described in rather basic and general terms or is hardly feasible.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Relevant advisory committee. The relevance of the project for the users involved is clear for all members of the advisory committee.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> During the project implementation, an excellent involvement and interaction dynamic is to be expected between the companies and the project team with an added value for the utilisation in Flanders.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The business concept exhibits certain shortcomings.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such as reasonable +</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project fits in with a broader cooperation with one or more companies from the advisory committee. <b>OR</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The input of the companies significantly exceeds the minimal eligibility requirement <b>OR</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There is a clear indication for an evolution towards very intensive involvement of the users during the project implementation.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The business concept is realistic and clear, with attention for the required profiles/expertise of the management.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such as positive +</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> At least one company carries out parallel R&amp;D activities whose objectives tie in directly with the subject matter of the SBO project with an added value for utilisation in Flanders.</li> <li>Such as positive +</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <i>The proposal contains a well thought out and substantiated starting point for a business plan.</i></li> </ul>

\* explanations that apply only to spin-off earmarked projects are mentioned in italics.

Utilisation dimension U	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Poor	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
U2.3 Quality of the pre-project phase		<input type="checkbox"/> During the project preparation, the interactions with relevant stakeholders (*) have remained limited and/or insufficient.	<input type="checkbox"/> During the project preparations, efforts have been made to interact with relevant stakeholders (*). The extent of these activities and/or the impact on the design of the project proposal is only demonstrated to a limited extent.	<input type="checkbox"/> A good preparatory phase is characterised by two-way interaction with relevant stakeholders (*) and by an added value for the design of the project proposal. Involvement in the utilisation approach is insufficiently demonstrated.	<input type="checkbox"/> The impact of the interaction with relevant stakeholders is clearly visible in the project application, both in the scientific activities and in the utilisation approach and the planned interactions.	<b>No scoring possibility</b>
U3.1 Competence and track record with regard to transfer and utilisation		<input type="checkbox"/> No utilisation competence is present or demonstrated. <input type="checkbox"/> The intentions for cooperations with potential users in previous project applications were artificial and were not realised in practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> The utilisation and transfer competence is very limited or virtually no evidence is given in the proposal. No effort is demonstrated to include a partner with transfer expertise in the project consortium. <input type="checkbox"/> The interaction with users and the attention towards the transfer of valorisable results during previous or ongoing projects left a lot to be desired.	<input type="checkbox"/> The competence and track record in transfer of research results still exhibits certain deficiencies. <input type="checkbox"/> The track record with regard to the effective transfer of valorisable results or the interaction with potential users during previous or ongoing projects has remained limited.	<input type="checkbox"/> The partners of the consortium have a good track record with regard to the transfer of research results. <input type="checkbox"/> The project is carried out by young start-up research teams with clear utilisation intentions. Any deficiencies are compensated by the active support from utilisation experts. <input type="checkbox"/> Previous or current projects have not yet led to a significant transfer and/or actual utilisation, but are characterised by intensive cooperation with companies and a goal-oriented focus on applications.	<input type="checkbox"/> The key partners in the consortium hold an undisputed leadership position in the transfer of research results to users in Flanders or beyond. <input type="checkbox"/> The project is implemented by young start-up research teams who have already achieved a significant transfer in the recent past. <input type="checkbox"/> Previous and/or ongoing projects have led to a significant transfer and/or actual utilisation or follow-up R&D projects funded by industry.
U4.1 Added value of the project in terms of sustainable development (with focus on the environmental dimension of sustainability)		<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable adverse environmental impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant environmental risks are present, but remain almost unrecognised in the proposal. <input type="checkbox"/> Major incompatibility with current or announced environmental legislation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Possible negative points of attention with regard to environmental aspects. <input type="checkbox"/> The expected environmental risks are only to a limited extent identified and addressed in the project.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable development is not applicable for this proposal. <input type="checkbox"/> Positive contribution to sustainable development.	<input type="checkbox"/> The majority of the anticipated follow-up R&D projects in the post-project phase qualify for sustainable development (SD) earmarking as industrial R&D projects. This is demonstrated by the applicants on the basis of an analysis and estimation of the environmental benefits which may be expected after a successful project and its R&D follow-up activities.

\* In case of transfer to existing companies: members of the advisory committee; in case of creation of a spin-off: stakeholders that can guide and advise the applicant on the feasibility of such a spin-off, such as transfer agencies, capital providers, business angels, potential customers, intermediary organisations, KOLs, etc.