

Score grid for the EOS full proposal

1. Competence of the individual researchers included in the EOS consortium							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very Good		Excellent/Outstanding	
1.a Scientific capacity							
Taking the scientific seniority into account, this criterion assesses to what extent the individual applicants have the necessary or adequate competences (i.e. knowledge and skills) to implement the proposed EOS research project.							
The included individual researchers lack the inherent competences required to perform the proposed research. A collaborative approach will not compensate for this.	Some of the included individual researchers do not possess the necessary competences to carry out the research in a good way. It can be expected that a collaborative approach will not compensate for this.	Not all included researchers are sufficiently skilled or knowledgeable. However, if the consortium is well composed, it could compensate for this.		In general, all the included individual researchers are (very) competent researchers with good to very good skills and knowledge to execute the proposed research. If the consortium is well composed, it will have a leverage effect and allow remarkable achievement by the consortium.		The scientific capacity with respect to the proposed research of each included individual researcher is excellent to outstanding.	
1.b Track record and main research achievements							
This criterion assesses to what extent the individual applicants, taking into account their scientific seniority, have a solid track record: scientific contributions to the field as evidenced by the quality (rather than the quantity) and impact of the publication record, as well as other scientific output and impact beyond publications.							
The track record and main research achievements of all included individual researchers are very weak.	Taking into account their scientific seniority, the track record and main research achievements of most of the included individual researchers are poor.	Taking into account the scientific seniority, the involved researchers do not have comparable track records and main research achievements. While some have a poor track record, the achievements of other involved researchers are reasonable. As a whole, the proposed research could be carried out.		Taking into account the scientific seniority and the fact that some involved applicants have an outstanding track record, the track record and main research achievements of most included individual researchers are good to very good. None of the individual applicants has a poor track record.		Taking into account their scientific seniority, the track record and main research achievements of all included individual researchers are impressive when compared to the international standard in their scientific domain.	
1.c International recognition							
This criterion assesses the international recognition of the included individual applicants in their scientific domain, taking into account their scientific seniority.							
None of the included individual researchers did contribute to their scientific field and none have international recognition.	Most of the included individual researchers are poorly internationally recognized for the contributions made within their scientific field.	Some of the included individual researchers are not internationally recognized, but this is compensated by the international visibility of other involved scientists.		All included individual researchers have at least some international recognition for their contributions within their scientific field.		All included individual researchers are highly recognized at the international level for the contributions made within their scientific field and beyond. They are considered amongst the best of their scientific domain (or 'rising stars' in their domain, taking into account the scientific seniority).	

2. Scientific quality of the EOS full proposal

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very Good		Excellent/Outstanding	
2.a Quality and originality of the research project With regard to the state-of-the-art, is the proposed research idea clear, innovative, original and timely? To what extent will the EOS project generate knowledge that contributes to the state-of-the-art?							
It is poorly written, unclear and/or contains mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings. <u>AND/OR</u> The targeted research goals are not original at all , the project does not build upon the international state-of-the-art. <u>AND/OR</u> The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges inherent to inventive fundamental research at all. The proposed research has been studied before and will as such not offer any added value to the state-of-the-art. <u>AND/OR</u> The rationale and hypothesis are completely lacking .	The full proposal is unclear or contains some mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings . <u>AND/OR</u> The targeted research goals are not very original and their innovative character is limited . <u>AND/OR</u> The project displays almost no scientific risks and challenges inherent to inventive fundamental research, making the project a safe bet. The planned research activities will not result in much added value for the domain , but are rather a iterative with respect to the international state-of-the-art . <u>AND/OR</u> The rationale and hypothesis are somehow lacking and/or rather weak .	The full proposal is reasonably clear and does not contain mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings. Some aspects of project are original . <u>BUT</u> Although the project displays some substantial risks or challenges inherent to inventive fundamental research, most of the project remains rather safe. The targeted research goals are primarily incremental according to the current state-of-the-art. <u>AND/OR</u> The rationale and hypothesis are present, however, not sufficiently convincing .	The full proposal is well-written and clear . The targeted research goals are timely, innovative and original . The project is characterized by a (very) good level of scientific risk and challenges inherent to inventive fundamental research. The scientific objectives offer a substantial added value relative to the state of the art . The rationale is strong, the hypothesis is clear and both build upon the international state-of-the-art in a sound manner (leap of knowledge). It is a challenging project.	The project is well-written, timely and addresses important challenges . It is unique, extremely original , and it distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research efforts at the international level. It is a pioneering project based on a ground-breaking rationale and challenging objectives that go beyond the state-of-the-art . Despite the high level of scientific risks or challenges, the project has a very high potential to generate knowledge that goes well beyond the state-of-the-art thereby setting new standards within the field.			
2.b Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project An EOS proposal must be scientifically challenging and nonetheless feasible. Is the research and methodological approach relevant, efficient and effective to reach the scientific goals? Does the EOS full proposal propose to use state-of-the-art methodology? Is the proposed scientific approach feasible?							
The research approach and/or key methodology is lacking . <u>AND/OR</u> The proposed research approach, and/or methodology are not adequate at all to execute the proposed research . <u>AND/OR</u> The project is not focussed and/or not feasible at all, because e.g. it involves too many planned activities (too broad).	The research approach is poorly described . <u>AND/OR</u> Most of the methodological aspects are not suited to execute the proposed research . Reaching the proposed research goal(s) is as such not feasible . <u>AND/OR</u> The feasibility and/or focus raises concerns .	The research approach seems reasonable BUT lacks key elements and contains some shortcomings in the research and/or methodological approach. The feasibility of the project is as such hard to judge or doubtful. <u>AND/OR</u> The methodological choices could have been more innovative compared to the state-of-the-art. <u>AND/OR</u> The project is feasible, but could have been more focussed . As a result, it is likely that the scientific goals will only be partially reached.	The research approach is well-elaborated . The proposed methodology is relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives, resulting in a feasible project. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings in the proposed research approach and methodology. Some aspects are (very) innovative from a methodological standpoint and compared to the state-of-the-art. A risk mitigation strategy is present. There is a (very) good focus and it is feasible within the 4-year time period.	The research approach is very convincing . Based on the international standards, the proposed methodology is the most relevant, efficient and effective to reach the scientific goals. The methodology is considered state-of-the-art state-of-the art or beyond in the domain . Research risks are thoroughly identified and the project proposes a carefully designed alternative research strategies/fall back options. There is an excellent focus and it is feasible within the 4-year time frame.			

3. Quality of the EOS consortium

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very Good		Excellent/Outstanding	
3.a Composition of the EOS-consortium: scientific justification for the involvement of each research group Each EOS consortium must be a well-balanced team including all required expertise and in which each expert has a key role to play in the proposed research activities. There must be a clear complementarity/synergy between the included researchers and the presence of each partner must be clearly motivated in the EOS proposal.							
The EOS consortium is not adequately composed and will not succeed in obtaining the targeted research objectives. <u>OR</u> The provided information does not allow to evaluate the consortium composition.	The EOS consortium is poorly composed casting serious doubt on whether the EOS consortium will be successful in executing the proposed research. Key expertise is lacking. <u>AND/OR</u> The complementarity of each included research group is not well described or lacking.	The EOS consortium is reasonably composed and its members will probably be able to implement the proposed research. However, the composition is not optimal as some expertise is either lacking or overrepresented. <u>AND/OR</u> Each researcher does not play a key role in the execution of the project. <u>AND/OR</u> The composition of the EOS consortium is not clearly described or well-motivated.	The EOS consortium composition is (very) solid. The EOS consortium will be able to execute the proposed research, as all the necessary expertise is present in a complementary manner to implement the proposed research is present. <u>AND</u> The composition of the EOS consortium is clearly described and (very) well motivated.	The EOS consortium is a perfectly balanced team in which each team member has a key role to play in the implementation of the proposed research activities. <u>AND</u> All the required expertise is present in the most optimal way, with a pronounced synergy between the researchers.			
3.b Balance in terms of work contribution amongst the diverse research groups Each EOS consortium must be balanced in terms of work contribution among each included research group. To what extent does every included research group optimally contribute to the proposed research activities? How do the contributions relate to the requested budget?							
As described, there is no balance in work distribution amongst the included research groups. Some groups will not contribute substantially to the proposed research despite a substantial budget request. <u>OR</u> The provided information does not allow to evaluate the planned contribution of each research group.	There is a poor balance in terms of work distribution among the included research groups, taking into account the requested budget and the expertise the different groups. <u>AND/OR</u> The planned contribution of each research group is poorly described.	There is a reasonable balance in terms of work distribution among the included research groups, taking into account the requested budget and the expertise the different groups. <u>AND/OR</u> The description of task distribution is present, however, could have been more clear or better justified.	There is a (very) good balance in terms of work distribution among the included research groups, taking into account the requested budget and the expertise the different groups. The description of task distribution is clear and well justified.	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. The description of task distribution is detailed and fully justified.			
3.c Work management: coordination and communication The consortium management plan should include the coordination tasks and the communication strategy among the different included research groups. In addition, the role of the spokesperson-coordinator should be well defined.							
The project proposal does not include any work plan or management strategy. <u>OR</u> It is not clear at all how the research will be coordinated among the different research groups. <u>AND</u> The role of the spokesperson is not defined at all.	The work plan and/or management strategy is insufficiently developed. <u>AND/OR</u> There is no evidence that individual efforts will be coordinated in a structured manner. <u>AND</u> The role of the spokesperson is not well-defined.	There is a management plan with coordination tasks and a communication strategy , however, both could be significantly improved. <u>AND/OR</u> The role of the spokesperson could be better described. His/her added value is not obvious in terms of coordination.	There is a (very) good management plan , including well-defined coordination tasks and a (very) good communication strategy. <u>AND</u> The role of the spokesperson is clearly defined and demonstrates his/her added value for the coordination of the project.	The consortium management is solid and perfectly described. It will most likely create a unique synergy among the various research groups. <u>AND</u> The choice of the spokesperson is ideal and his/her added value is obvious.			