	Poor (-2)	Fair (-1)	Good (0)	Excellent (+1)
I. Scientific quality				
A. Candidate				
1. Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset of the candidate	□ Research qualities are rather limited, but with very good coaching the candidate can achieve a PhD diploma; the candidate is sufficiently motivated.	□ The candidate still has to make progress in his/her research skills; is somewhat less mature but sufficiently convincing.	□ Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good; can present new concepts based on well-founded arguments; a motivated candidate.	□ Very good reasoning, very good critical-scientific mind; can present new concepts in a very sound manner; very convincing and motivated candidate.
2. Scientific knowledge and insight into the project	□ Has barely enough basic knowledge to carry out the PhD research; makes mistakes within his/her own field of research. Knowledge in the field is not convincing; additional efforts are needed to address these shortcomings; Insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, to be improved.	□ Has good basic knowledge; makes mistakes in his/her own research field, but without endangering the implementation of the PhD research project; moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques.	□ Has very good basic knowledge, does not make mistakes in his/her own field of research, but is rather restricted out of it; has a good insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques.	□ Very good basic knowledge; knows his/her own research field like the back of his/her hand; also capable of answering questions outside his/her own research field; has an excellent insight in the proposed approach and techniques; candidate knows exactly what he/she will do and why

B. **Project**	Poor (-2)	Fair (-1)	Good (0)	Excellent (+1)
1. Scientific quality level and challenges	□ The proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the international state-of-the-art. □ The project does not offer sufficient balance between challenging research in accordance with a PhD level and a valorization potential for the company.	□ The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art is still acceptable but less pronounced or less well elaborated. □ A significant part of the project does not deserve as much to be qualified as challenging research, in accordance with a PhD level.	□ The proposal can be qualified as basic research of high scientific quality, including a good level of scientific challenges according to a PhD-level.	□ The proposal is highly innovative and unique, and offers a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art ("pioneer project").
2. Quality of the research approach and feasibility	□ The research approach and the project planning are characterized by serious flaws and shortcomings. The feasibility is low or the scientific project goals are expressed in an insufficiently clear manner to allow an assessment of their feasibility within the project. □ Serious shortcomings in the support and/or facilities.	□ The research approach and the project planning are reasonable, but contain some gaps or shortcomings. The feasibility is not realistic, but this does not pose any risk for obtaining the PhD-degree. □ The support and facilities to obtain a PhD are reasonable, but additional efforts are needed to fill some gaps.	□ The research approach is well suited for reaching the research objectives, the research planning is clear. The project as planned is feasible within the timeframe of the project. □ The support by both the scientific and industrial promoter provides a solid base for obtaining a PhD-degree.	<u>All requirements for a "positive" score are fully met and</u> □ in addition, the research approach also includes a thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.

II. Valorisation				
A. Candidate	Poor (-2)	Fair (-1)	Good (0)	Excellent (+1)
1. Insight and vision on the strategic importance of the project for the valorization objectives	□ Very limited insight and vision on the valorization prospects for the company. The candidate cannot situate his doctoral research in the valorization strategy of the company, additional efforts are needed to improve this. □ It is evident that no interactions have occurred between the candidate and the company.	□ The candidate still has to develop somewhat his understanding and vision on the potential and applicability of the project. □ The relevance of the research approach and the added value for the company are not presented convincingly.	□ The candidate has a good insight and a good vision on the valorization prospects for the company, he/she can situate the importance of the research project in a well-founded and realistic manner. □ It is evident that there has been a good interaction with the company.	□ <u>All requirements for a "positive" score are fully met and</u> □ A broad vision of the utilization potential, even in other domains and sectors.
2. Knowledge and insight in the valorization path	□ The candidate has a very limited knowledge of the valorization path. □ The candidate has a very limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to bring the intended applications into reality.	□ The candidate has a rather limited insight in the valorization path. □ The candidate has a rather limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to bring the intended applications into reality, but he/she is motivated to improve his/her knowledge in this matter.	□ The candidate has a good insight in the efforts that are necessary to implement the results in case of success. □ The candidate has a good insight in possible bottlenecks and strengths to come to the applicability of the results.	□ Very good insight in the valorization path. □ Very good knowledge of the bottlenecks and strengths for bringing the intended applications into reality.

B. Project	Poor (-2)	Fair (-1)	Good (0)	Excellent (+1)
1. Strategic importance	☐ The strategic importance of the project for the company is unclear. ☐ There is a mismatch between the project content and the opportunities for valorization.	☐ The strategic importance of the project for the company has been estimated too optimistically (there are many questions regarding the real importance of the project for the valorization). ☐ Certain gaps and shortcomings are present in the description of the potential applications for the company, but these can be expected to be present.	☐ The project has a clear impact on the valorization. ☐ The scientific results can have a clear added value for the company.	☐ The project can result in an important diversification for the company, or in a new technology platform with many potential applications.
2. Size and probability of the expected valorization (in case of scientific success)	☐ The intended applications are of little economic relevance. ☐ The valorization is primarily focused on companies outside Flanders and is very limited for Flanders. *If applicable:* ☐ Substantial bottlenecks, barriers or risk factors are evident, the impact on the valorization potential is not tackled sufficiently in the project proposal, or the bottlenecks are difficult to resolve. ☐ The company will lack the required capabilities for valorizing the results.	☐ The project is targeted to a problem with limited economic applications, or the objectives are only partially relevant for the intended applications. ☐ Limited parts of the expected value chain are located in Flanders. *If applicable:* ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors are only partially discussed in the proposal, but may be manageable. ☐ The competition has significantly more comparative advantages, even in the case of technical success.	☐ A good potential for the company is demonstrated. ☐ Important parts of the value chain are located in Flanders. *If applicable:* ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors have been proactively analyzed in the proposal, and are almost absent or manageable. ☐ The company has a good competitive position in the expected valorization process.	☐ The targeted valorization for the company is realistic, extensive and thoroughly substantiated. ☐ The value chain will principally be located in Flanders. *If applicable:* ☐ Strong starting position for IPR, including “freedom to operate”, essential for the valorization chances. ☐ The company has significant comparative advantages in the target market.