

Score grid for SBO projects with a societal 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"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal shows the characteristics of a catching-up effort relative to the international state-of-the-art. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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").
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"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal shows a rather limited level of challenges and its high-risk/high-gain nature is on the low side. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal demonstrates a very clear high-risk/high-gain profile and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, concepts and strategies.
S1.3 Intrinsic scientific feasibility of the project goals (assuming that the project is well conducted and managed)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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). <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. <input type="checkbox"/> The project offers only a marginal or limited contribution towards the ultimate attainment of the stated scientific goals. <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	<p>No scoring possibility</p>
S2.1 Quality of the research approach		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> There is a discrepancy or mismatch between the research goals and the research approach. <input type="checkbox"/> The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is characterised by serious flaws or shortcomings. Structural adjustments to the research approach are needed. <input type="checkbox"/> The matching between the research goals and the chosen approach needs to be substantially improved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings and/or leaves room for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the strategic research objectives. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings. 	<p>All requirements for a "positive" score are fully met.</p> <p><u>And in addition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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.

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
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. <u>And in addition:</u> <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.	No scoring possibility
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 <u>and</u> the synergy within the consortium is sufficient. OR <input type="checkbox"/> The available research competence and infrastructure is sufficient <u>and</u> 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"> <input type="checkbox"/> Virtually no applications or exclusivity to one user. <input type="checkbox"/> The application potential is insufficiently substantiated or inadequate. <input type="checkbox"/> The intended application is not clear or of little societal relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The application potential is real, but rather restricted to a limited number of organisations from the target group. <input type="checkbox"/> The project offers substantive applications, but with a relatively low probability. <input type="checkbox"/> The project responds to a demand expressed by a number of societal stakeholders, but with a less pronounced strategic interest, or the project is targeted to a problem with real but limited societal applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project offers a strategic added value for a number of societal stakeholders 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. <input type="checkbox"/> The project effectively responds to a demand of strategic importance for a group of societal stakeholders. Connects with the activities of this group of stakeholders. Has sufficient innovation potential so that, if successful, it will almost certainly be translated into a number of applications of sufficient size. 	<p>Such as reasonable +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> thoroughly substantiated and large-scale utilisation is to be expected <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> it is very clear what delta can be created with the societal stakeholders <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> if successful, it will move these stakeholders into higher gear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project offers a range of applications with a clear strategic added value for a large group of societal stakeholders or a breakthrough value of a disruptive nature, so that a substantial utilisation is to be expected for a large group of stakeholders, with multiple utilisation paths in various organisations as well as a multiplier effect. <p>Such as positive +</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project objective responds to a demand that is strategically important for a large group of societal stakeholders <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> with a potential for a very large utilisation <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> across organisations with different activities.
U1.2 Strategic importance (=relevance) of the research approach for the applications		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed approach will not result in utilisation. <input type="checkbox"/> There is a mismatch between the project execution and the utilisation objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project approach is only partially relevant for the anticipated utilisation. Either the contents of the proposal does not follow the optimal path to reach the intended utilisation opportunities or only a part of the project is relevant for the intended applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. <input type="checkbox"/> The project goes fairly far in the R&D process and contains a mix of strategic basic research and normal developmental tasks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The right approach to achieve the intended applications. No superfluous sub-aspects. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The deliverable(s) of the proposal fall in the direct R&D&I activities of at least one of the stakeholders. 	<p>Such as positive +</p> <p>The project approach is the best conceivable approach to achieve the desired utilisation. The intended applications are clearly the driving force behind the implementation approach. Furthermore, the approach is highly cost-effective.</p>
U1.3 R&D prospects and utilization of stakeholders after completion of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Focussed only on knowledge creation without any prospect for follow-up R&D with a societal finality. <input type="checkbox"/> Results can be immediately applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The further follow-up activities are almost not developed or show little or no prospect for follow-up R&D projects. <input type="checkbox"/> The project covers primarily fundamental research with a limited focus on applications with a societal finality. <input type="checkbox"/> A major portion of the project virtually coincides with the normal research horizon of societal stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up projects are relevant for various societal stakeholders and there is a commitment of the stakeholders that will participate in the follow-up projects. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> These follow-up projects involve a clear R&D&I dimension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Follow-up projects are relevant for various societal stakeholders and there is a commitment of the stakeholders that will participate in the follow-up projects. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The follow-up projects involve a clear R&D&I dimension. 	<p>No scoring possibility</p>

Utilisation dimension U	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Poor	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
U1.4 Intrinsic feasibility of the utilisation and intrinsic strategic added value for Flanders		<input type="checkbox"/> Utilisation not feasible.	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilisation is actually feasible but there are only limited prospects for utilisation in Flanders: utilisation is focussed <u>primarily</u> on non-Flemish users.	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilisation in Flanders is realistic and well-founded, but not really substantial. Important parts of the utilisation value chain are located outside of Flanders, or the possible utilisation in Flanders is inherently limited in scope.	<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.	No scoring possibility
U2.1 Vision and approach to utilisation (including bottlenecks)		<input type="checkbox"/> The utilisation plan is insufficiently elaborated and substantiated.	<input type="checkbox"/> The vision and approach to utilisation exhibits certain shortcomings. Structural changes to the utilisation approach are needed. <input type="checkbox"/> The chosen utilisation approach is less optimal for certain aspects.	<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.	<input type="checkbox"/> A reasoned vision for all utilisation aspects (e.g., based on a SWOT analysis and the like). <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant contribution by a person designated for utilisation.	Such as positive + <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).
U2.2 Feasibility utilisation approach through interaction with members of the advisory committee (during the project)		<input type="checkbox"/> In principle, there is a wide range of applications, but no viable utilisation path is demonstrated. <input type="checkbox"/> There are important points of attention regarding the relevance of the users involved or regarding the proper alignment between the results and the profile of the users involved.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project includes the involvement of a number of users, but without thorough substantiation of the specific utility and societal relevance of the results for these users.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project provides for proper interaction with relevant and representative users in Flanders with clear involvement. The relevance of the project is clear to the majority of the members.	<input type="checkbox"/> The project provides for proper interaction with relevant and representative users in Flanders with clear involvement. The relevance of the project is clear to virtually all members.	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant advisory committee. Strong interaction dynamic with users. The relevance of the project is clear to all members of the advisory committee. If scientifically successful, the project will almost certainly lead to transfer of the results.
U2.3 Quality of the pre-project phase		<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal preparation is purely supply-driven by the research teams. No efforts are demonstrated to interact with potential users.	<input type="checkbox"/> During the project preparation, the interactions with users have remained limited and/or insufficient.	<input type="checkbox"/> During the project preparation, efforts have been made to match potential users to the research design. 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"/> The proposal shows that there has been a good interaction with users which had a relevant impact on the design of the project proposal.	<input type="checkbox"/> A well documented preparatory phase is demonstrated, characterised by two-way interaction with potential users and with an added value for the design of the project proposal.
U3.1 Competence and track record in terms of 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 SBO projects left a lot to be desired.	<input type="checkbox"/> The competence and track record in transfer of research results still exhibits certain gaps or 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Previous or current SBO projects have not yet led to a significant transfer and/or actual utilisation, but are characterised by intensive cooperation with societal stakeholders 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 societal users in Flanders or/and 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 SBO projects have led to a significant transfer and/or actual utilisation or follow-up R&D projects funded by government entities or societal stakeholders.

Utilisation dimension U	Insufficient information	Unacceptable	Poor	Reasonable	Positive	Excellent
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"/> Substantial environmental risks are present, but are not identified 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 project shows a high level of ambition to improve the integration of sustainability into government policy or with societal organisations and/or to achieve a sustainability oriented system innovation or transition where the environmental dimension is the central focus. This is thoroughly elaborated and substantiated in the project application.

In the societal component of the SBO programme, a **selection advantage** is implemented for projects with a **meaningful cooperation with relevant societal stakeholders in application oriented activities from the third project year onwards**, in order to bridge the gap between the SBO results and their practical applications. This is implemented by the possibility to give a bonus to such projects, provided these projects already meet the minimal requirements of the SBO decree (i.e. at least a reasonably good score on both evaluation dimensions). This bonus is quantified as an additional “delta score” +1 on the utilisation dimension.