I. Scientific quality				
A. Candidate + consortium	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Scientific knowledge and coaching				
	☐ Manifest gaps and shortcomings in the knowledge of the state-of-the-art, **or** ☐ The guidance and mentoring provided are judged inadequate.	☐ Fair but incomplete knowledge of the state-of-the-art; this does not pose any risk for the implementation of the project, **or** ☐ The guidance and mentoring for the implementation of the project is reasonable (additional attention is needed to guide the candidate).	☐ Very good knowledge of the state-of-the-art within own field of research, **and** ☐ The guidance and mentoring for the execution of the project is adequate.	<u>Requirements good</u> + ☐ Very good knowledge of the state-of-the-art, even outside own field of research.
2. Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset				
	☐ Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor, **or** ☐ He/she is unfamiliar with the topic of the project. Insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, **or** ☐ Poor motivation, not based on a fundamental interest in the proposed project.	☐ Moderate reasoning skills or critical mindset, **or** ☐ Moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, **or** ☐ Moderate motivation.	☐ Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good; can present new concepts based on well-founded arguments; **and** ☐ He/she has a good insight in the proposed approach and techniques; **and** ☐ Convincing and motivated candidate.	☐ Very good reasoning, very good critical-scientific mindset; can present new concepts in a very sound manner; **and** ☐ He/she has an excellent insight in the proposed approach and techniques; candidate knows exactly what he/she will do and why; **and** ☐ Very convincing and motivated candidate; he/she is the driving force behind this project.

B. Project	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1. Scientific quality level and challenges (including clarity innovation goal)				
	□ The proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the international state-of-the-art, **or** □ The innovation goal is completely unclear or no milestones are defined for phase 1, **or** □ The necessity of implementing a first phase is completely unclear.	□ The added value of the proposal relative to the international state-of-the-art is acceptable, **or** □ The innovation goal is acceptable, but shows important shortcomings in terms of clarity and verifiability, or the milestones to be reached in phase 1 are not defined clearly enough, **or** □ The evidence of the necessity of implementing a first phase is rather weak.	□ The project builds upon and extends the international state-of-the-art, can be qualified as basic research of high quality, including a good level of risks, challenges and inventiveness, **and** □ The innovation goal is clear, to the point and verifiable, and the milestones to be reached in phase 1 are defined concretely (and can be verified), **and** □ A first phase is required. Risks are too high to transfer results immediately.	<u>Requirements good +</u> □ The proposal is highly innovative and unique, and offers a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art ("pioneer project"); the proposal demonstrates a very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, concepts and strategies.
2. Quality of the research approach and feasibility				
	□ The research approach and the project planning display serious flaws and shortcomings, **or** □ There is a mismatch between the research goals and the research approach, **or** □ Crucial challenges are not identified, **or** □ 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.	□ Research approach and planning are reasonable, but contain some shortcomings, **or** □ The research approach offers only a limited contribution towards the scientific goals (or insufficient focus on the crucial aspects), **or** □ Not all challenges have been identified; this has a clear impact on the attainment of the scientific goals, **or** □ The feasibility is not realistic, but it is likely that the scientific goals will be partially reached.	□ The research approach is well suited for reaching the research objectives; risks were identified and the research planning is clear, **and** □ The project as planned is feasible within the timeframe of the project.	<u>Requirements good +</u> □ The research approach includes a thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.

II. Valorization				
A. Candidate + consortium	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Insight in the strategic importance of the project (for companies/sectors) and valorization				
	☐ Limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Limited knowledge of the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results.	☐ Rather limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Rather limited knowledge of the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Rather limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results.	☐ Good insight in the strategic importance of the project, and the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results, **and** ☐ Good knowledge of the market potential and the valorization path.	☐ Very good insight in the strategic importance of the project, and the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results, **and** ☐ Very good knowledge of the market potential and the valorization path.
2. Commitment for valorization (including cooperation with industry/industrial mentor)				
	☐ The candidate shows no motivation to interact with the industry/industrial mentor or to develop complementary skills to bring the results into practice.	☐ The commitment of the candidate is moderate to pay enough attention to the applicability of the results and to interact actively with the industry/industrial mentor.	☐ The candidate is clearly motivated to pay attention to the applicability of the scientific results and to interact actively with the industry/industrial mentor; there is a clear personal commitment of the candidate to develop skills in this matter.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The research group has a good track record with regard to transfer and/or actual utilization or follow-up R&D-projects funded by industry.

Project – Phase I (assessment of the **broad** applicability of the results)

B. Project	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Strategic importance of the research approach for the applications (valorization objectives)				
	☐ There is an evident mismatch between the planned execution of the research project and the opportunities for valorization, **or** ☐ The project is only focused on knowledge creation without a prospect for or contribution to applications.	☐ The research approach is only partially relevant for the valorization objectives. Either the content of the proposal is not the optimal path to reach the intended valorization opportunities, or only a part of the project is relevant for the intended applications.	☐ The research approach is well-thought through and relevant for the planned applications. If successful, the results will effectively contribute to turning the valorization objectives into reality.	☐ The project approach is the best conceivable way to achieve the intended application. The target applications are clearly the driving force behind the research approach.
2. Size and probability of the expected valorization (in case of scientific success)				
	☐ The intended applications are not clear, or are of little economic relevance (valorization = unlikely), **or** ☐ The valorization is primarily focused on companies based outside Flanders and is very limited for Flanders, **or** ☐ Substantial bottlenecks 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 project offers possible applications, but with a relatively low probability, or the project is targeted at a problem with limited economic applications, **or** ☐ The possible valorization in Flanders is inherently limited, **or** ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors are only partially discussed in the proposal, but may be manageable.	☐ A good potential is demonstrated, is realistic and thoroughly substantiated (high probability), **and** ☐ The targeted valorization in Flanders is realistic and thoroughly substantiated as well, **and** ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors were analyzed proactively in the proposal, and are almost absent or manageable.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The project offers a range of applications with a clear strategic value for a large group of companies and/or sectors, **or** ☐ Many companies, which are capable of applying the results, are present in Flanders, **or** ☐ Strong starting position, important assets for the valorization.

Project – **Phase 2** (assessment of the **potential for the industrial partner**)

III Valorization potential for the industrial partner				
B. Project	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Excellent**
1. Strategic importance of the project for the company				
	☐ The strategic importance of the project for the company is unclear, **or** ☐ It is clear that no interactions have taken place or are being planned between the candidate and the industrial mentor.	☐ The strategic importance of the project for the company has been estimated too optimistically, **or** ☐ Certain gaps and shortcomings are present in the description of the potential applications for the company, but their presence can be expected, **or** ☐ Limited interactions have taken place or are being planned between the candidate and the industrial mentor.	☐ The project has a clear impact on the valorization and the scientific results can have a clear added value for the company, **and** ☐ The proposal shows that there has been a good interaction with the company and also during the project execution sufficient interactions are planned.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The project can result in an important diversification for the company, or in a new technology platform with many potential applications, **or** ☐ During the project execution a substantial amount of time is spent by the candidate in the company.
2. Size and probability of the expected valorization (in case of scientific success)				
	☐ The valorization potential for the company has not been described, **or** ☐ Very limited realistic market expectations, or the company will lack the required capabilities for valorization, **or** ☐ Unclear/uncertain which parts of the value chain are located in Flanders, or whether there will be sufficient valorization in Flanders, **or** ☐ Substantial 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 potential for the company is only summarily described, **or** ☐ Shrinking market, or market outlook unclear, or the competition has significantly more comparative advantages, **or** ☐ Limited parts of the expected value chain are located in Flanders, **or** ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors are only partially discussed in the proposal, but may be manageable.	☐ A good potential for the company is demonstrated, **and** ☐ The company has a good competitive position in the expected valorization process, **and** ☐ Important parts of the value chain are located in Flanders, **and** ☐ Potential bottlenecks, barriers and risk factors have been proactively analyzed in the proposal, and are almost absent or manageable.	☐ The targeted valorization for the company is realistic, extensive and thoroughly substantiated, **and** ☐ The company has significant comparative advantages in the target market, **and** ☐ The value chain will principally be located in Flanders, **and** ☐ Strong starting position for IPR, including "freedom to operate", essential for the valorization chances.