

Annex 1: Québec-Flanders Bilateral Research Cooperation Program Criteria and Score Grid – International Independent Peer Review

1. Competence of the individual researchers							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>This criterion assesses to what extent the individual researchers, included in the bilateral research project, have the necessary competences (i.e. knowledge and skills) to implement the proposed project. Do not solely assess to what extent the individual researchers, <u>taking into account their scientific seniority</u>, have a solid track record of international peer reviewed publications but also consider other important research achievements, (inter)national network, etc. International recognition of the included individual researchers in their scientific domain is necessary to receive outstanding scores for this criterion.</p>							
<p>Some of the included individual researchers lack the inherent competences required to perform the proposed research. Teamwork will not compensate for this weak link. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers which is, considering their scientific seniority, unacceptable and as such insufficient to adequately contribute to the proposed research.</p>	<p>Some of the included individual researchers do not fully possess the necessary competences, expertise, skills and/or experience to carry out their part of the research in a proper way. Only through close collaboration among all included researchers, will they manage to carry out the actual research. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers which, taking into account their scientific seniority, is poor and as such possibly insufficient to adequately contribute to the proposed research.</p>	<p>The competence, expertise, skills and/or experience of some of the individual researchers in the consortium leads to concerns on a successful execution of the proposed research. However, as a whole, the research consortium possess the necessary competences to carry out the proposed research. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of the included individual researchers which is sufficient to carry out the proposed research.</p>	<p>All the included individual researchers are competent and independent researchers with (very) good skills and knowledge to execute the proposed research. The scientific capacity of each included individual researcher is (very) good and together they will bring the proposed research to a (very) good end. Taking into account the scientific seniority, the track record and main research achievements of all included individual researchers is (very) good and confirms the (very) good scientific capacity to execute the proposed research.</p> <p>Some of the included individual researchers are less internationally recognized for the contributions made within their scientific domain but this is being compensated by the more international contributions of other included individual researchers.</p>	<p>All the included individual researchers are competent and independent researchers with excellent skills and extended knowledge of the scientific domain. Taking into account the scientific seniority, the track record and main research achievements of all key members of the consortium is impressive. The excellent competence and available expertise, skills and/or experience gives confidence in a successful execution of the proposed research. Key partners of the consortium are internationally recognised amongst the best of their scientific domain (or 'rising stars' in their domain, taking into account the scientific seniority).</p>			

2. Scientific quality of the bilateral research project.							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
2.a. Scientific added value, rationale (relevance) and originality. The targeted research goals of a bilateral research proposal must contribute to the current international state-of-the-art. To what extent is the proposal original and will it generate knowledge that goes beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g. novel concepts or novel approaches)? Does the bilateral research project contain a strong rationale and robust/original hypothesis, does it propose innovative methodological approaches and is it sufficiently detailed?							
The targeted research results are not original at all, do not build upon the international state-of-art and will not offer an added value to the state-of-the-art in its domain AND/OR have even been studied before (duplicate of previous studies). AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are lacking.	The targeted research results are not very original and their innovative character is limited. The planned research activities will not result in much added value for the domain but are rather a catching up with respect to the international state-of-art. AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are rather weak.	The project is moderately original and/or the targeted research results are primarily incremental in terms of contribution to the current state-of-the-art. The rationale and hypothesis are present however not strongly motivated.	The targeted research goals are timely, innovative and original. The research results will contribute clearly to the current international state-of-the-art in the scientific domain. The rationale is strong and hypothesis clear.	The project is timely, unique and extremely original. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research efforts at the international level. It is a pioneering project based on ground-breaking and challenging ideas, concepts and research strategies.			
2.b. Quality of the research approach (methodology), feasibility and focus. A bilateral research proposal must be scientifically challenging and nonetheless feasible. To what extent is the outlined scientific approach challenging, feasible and focussed, bearing in mind the project the requested budget and a project duration of three years?							
The research methodology in unappropriated to reach the scientific goals. The research approach is not suited, insufficiently elaborated. AND/OR The project is not feasible because it involves too many planned activities. OR/AND The project is too broad and not focussed at all. OR/AND The project content does not require the requested budget or time	The research approach shows serious weaknesses and/or shortcomings. AND/OR The research approach lacks key elements and should be improved substantially to meet the state-of-art. AND/OR The feasibility and/or focus of the scientific project objectives is doubtful. OR/AND The project is not ambitious enough.	The research approach is appropriate but lacks some elements and/or contains some shortcomings. The methodology is state of art.. AND/OR The project is feasible but could've been more focussed. It is however likely that the scientific goals will be delivered partly AND/OR The project could've been more challenging AND/OR more elaborated for the applied budget and/or timeframe.	The proposed methodology is (very) well elaborated, relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. There are no significant gaps and/or shortcomings and methodologically sufficiently innovative. AND The balance between scientific challenge and feasibility of the scientific project objectives is (very) good. The work plan proposes an efficient use of the budget and the three-year time frame. Risk mitigation strategy is present.	The proposed methodology is the most relevant, efficient and effective to reach the scientific goals and is considered as international state-of-the-art methodology in this domain. The methodology is highly innovative, well elaborated and perfectly clear. AND Excellent focus, optimal balance between high-level scientific challenges and intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project objectives. The work plan fits perfectly the three-year time frame and requested budget. In addition, the proposal clearly identifies potential risks and proposes carefully designed alternative research strategies and 'fall back' options.			
2.c. Work plan. A bilateral research project must have a clearly defined work plan outlining the different work packages with their goals, research activities, timing and deliverables. A clear description of the roles of each included researcher is crucial to understand how a bilateral research project will be executed and managed. The presence of well-defined coordination tasks and a good communication strategy in the work plan can lead to outstanding scores in this criterion.							
The project proposal does not include any sufficiently elaborated work plan that allows the assessment of this criterion. It is not clear at all by whom, when and how each proposed research activity will be performed.	The work plan and task allocation is not sufficiently developed. Important information is missing and significant structural adjustments are necessary.	The work plan is satisfactory and touches upon the different roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages. However, in particular aspects the work plan and/or task allocation amongst the consortium partners remains vague or confusing and could be significantly improved.	The work plan, including the different work packages, is (very) clear and concretely defined, including the roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages.	The work plan is sound and meticulously defined including the different roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages. The goals and research activities of each work package are described in detail. In addition, the work plan includes well-defined project management tasks and a good communication strategy which contributes optimal to the smooth execution of each work package.			

3. Quality of the proposed collaboration of the bilateral research project.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable	Good/Very Good		Excellent/Outstanding		
<p>3.a. Added value of the proposed collaboration</p> <p>This criterion assesses whether the collaboration has an added value for the bilateral research proposal. To what extent is the collaboration, containing the right combination of partners and expertises, unique and crucial to execute the proposed research. Is the rationale for bringing together these researchers/research groups clear and strong or is this partnership rather randomly composed and artificial? The complementarity/synergy of the included researchers and equipment must be clearly motivated in the research proposal.</p>							
<p>The collaboration is artificial: There is no added value in the proposed bilateral collaboration. The proposed research can be performed alone or with local partners equally well. AND/OR The synergy in expertises and the rationale for collaboration is completely lacking. AND/Or The bilateral research team is not adequately composed which may hinder achieving the targeted research objectives.</p>	<p>The added value of the proposed bilateral collaboration is limited and its rationale is (rather) lacking. It is not clear how the included expertises are relevant and needed for the project. AND/OR Not every necessary expertise is either present or some expertise is doubled. The role of each included research group is not well described or is redundant.</p>	<p>The added value of the collaboration is acceptable, but not fully convincing. The complementarity is present however not strong. The synergy between the research groups/expertises could've been stronger and/or need a better argumentation. AND/OR the composition is not optimal as expertise is either lacking or doubled. The role of each researcher in the execution of the project is not clear.</p>	<p>The added value of the bilateral collaboration is clearly present and contributes (very) good to the execution of the project. There is a (very) good rationale for setting up this collaboration. The synergy between the research groups/expertises is (very) strong. AND/OR All the necessary expertise and equipment to execute the proposed research is present. The composition of and task allocation amongst the bilateral research team is clearly described and (very) well motivated. Deficiencies are sufficiently compensated by the other consortium members.</p>	<p>The synergy between the consortium partners is pronounced and the complementarity is key for the successful execution of the proposed research activities. The reasons for including these specific research groups/expertises are perfectly clear and valid. The proposed collaboration is crucial to achieve the proposed research goals. The bilateral research team is a perfectly balanced team of excellent internationally recognized researchers (taking into account the scientific seniority), in which each one of them has a vital role to play in the execution of the proposed research activities. All the required expertise and equipment is present in the most optimal way.</p>			
<p>3.b. Balance in terms of work contribution amongst the diverse research groups</p> <p>Each bilateral research consortium must be balanced in terms of work contribution between the Flemish and foreign research groups. To what extent does every included research group optimally contribute to the proposed research activities? How do the contributions relate to the requested budget?</p>							
<p>There is no balance in work distribution amongst the included research groups. There is an unequilibrium between requested budget and workload for some of the groups.</p>	<p>No possibility for scoring</p>	<p>There is a reasonable balance in terms of work distribution amongst the included research groups, taking into account the requested budget and the expertise within the different groups.</p>	<p>No possibility for scoring</p>	<p>Each research group contributes in the most optimal way to the proposed research activities. There are no imbalances in terms of work contribution, taking into account the requested budget of each included research group.</p>			