

FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH PROJECT: scoring descriptors “Research group”

1 Scientific capacity, track record and collaboration of the research group

This criterion assesses to what extent the applicants have the necessary competences and infrastructure to implement the proposed research project. This criterion also assesses to what extent the individual applicants, taking into account their scientific seniority, have made important contributions to the state-of-the-art in their respective domain.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
1. scientific capacity, track record and collaboration (supervisor-spokesperson, (co-)supervisor(s), and research team(s))							
Essential research expertise, knowhow or infrastructure is lacking to carry out this project.	The track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers is, taking into account their scientific seniority, less present, or less competitive <u>And (if applicable)</u> The complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.	The proposing PI’s and research group have a good scientific track record. There are some doubts on whether the available competence is sufficiently fitted to an optimal execution of the project. <u>And (if applicable)</u> The consortium is not optimally composed: some expertise is either lacking or overlapping.	PI’s and involved research teams in general give evidence of a proper scientific track record and research achievements (considering PI’s scientific seniority). The available research expertise is fit to the project, <u>and/or</u> PI’s and involved research teams evidence a growing scientific reputation. This project seamlessly fits in this progress <u>and (if applicable)</u> Complementary expertise and proper collaboration between research groups	The scientific track record and research achievements of all included PI’s and research team is excellent and internationally recognized, and fully suited to execute the proposed project. <u>and/or</u> PI’s and involved research teams evidence a growing scientific reputation, for which the project could be a breakthrough. <u>And (if applicable)</u> There is pronounced synergy between consortium partners,			

2. Fundamental research project: scoring descriptors “Project”

2.a. Scientific quality, relevance of the research project & originality

An FWO research project must have an important contribution 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 theories, innovative concepts or approaches, new methods, ...)?

2.b. Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project

To what extent is the proposed research approach appropriate to achieve the goals laid down in the research project? To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible, bearing in mind the project duration of four years? Feasibility also includes an assessment whether adequate staffing (profile (PhD, postdoc, technicians) and a good estimation of the workload and required consumables/equipment) are requested.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
2.a. Scientific quality, relevance of the research project & originality							
The proposal contains structural flaws <u>and/or</u> does not offer scientific added value to the international state-of-the-art and to already ongoing research. <u>and/or</u> The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges.	The added value of the proposal w.r.t. the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research is limited. The project is rather a catching-up effort. <u>and/or</u> Rather limited level of scientific risks and pronounced challenges	The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research is still reasonable but less pronounced or less well elaborated. <u>and/or</u> Not all parts of the proposal fit well with the requirements of high-risk, challenging and inventive fundamental research.	The scientific goals of the proposal offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research activities. The project builds upon the international state-of-the-art in a sound manner. <u>and</u> The proposal as a whole fits well with the requirements of high-risk, challenging and inventive fundamental research.	The project is highly original and very unique. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research and has large impact potential ('groundbreaking' research). The proposal demonstrates a very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies.			
2.b. Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project							
Evident discrepancy/mismatch between research goals and research approach. <u>and/or</u> The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach.	The research approach shows serious flaws or shortcomings. The research approach must be improved substantially. <u>and/or</u> The match between research goals and approach needs to be adjusted considerably. <u>and (if applicable)</u> The work distribution is not well balanced taking into account the expertise of the partners. The roles of each partner are not well defined.	The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings <u>and/or</u> leaves room for improvement. <u>and/or</u> The balance between scientific challenge and feasibility of the scientific project objectives is reasonable. <u>and/or</u> Some gaps or shortcomings in project planning and management. Resources may need to be reviewed. <u>and (if applicable)</u> The balance in work distribution is reasonably in line with the expertise. Reasonably well defined roles of each partner.	The proposed methodology is well elaborated, relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. No significant gaps or shortcomings. <u>and</u> The project implementation is realistic and feasible within the four-year time frame. Timescales and resources are properly justified. <u>and (if applicable)</u> Good balance in work distribution taking into account the expertise of each partner. Well defined role of each partner.	Requirements “(very) good”, <u>and</u> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options, <u>and (if applicable)</u> The research plan is focused on high level of integration, cross-fertilization and synergy between the partners. The role of each partner is clearly defined.			