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)				
	☐ Insufficient scientific challenges, **or** ☐ No activities with regard to the preparation of the business plan, **or** ☐ The innovation goal is completely unclear.	☐ Rather limited scientific challenges, **or** ☐ Suboptimal balance between the scientific activities and the activities for the preparation of the business plan, **or** ☐ The innovation goal is acceptable, but shows important shortcomings in terms of clarity and verifiability.	☐ The project builds upon and extends the international state-of-the-art, and contains sufficient scientific challenges for a postdoctoral researcher, **and** ☐ There is a good balance between the scientific work and the relevant activities in preparation of a business plan, **and** ☐ The innovation goal is clear, to the point and verifiable.	<u>Requirements good +</u> ☐ The proposal is highly innovative and includes a very solid start for a business plan with a view to the creation of a new spin-off company.
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 (during the project) 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 (during the project) 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 and valorization				
	☐ Limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results. ☐ Limited knowledge of the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Limited knowledge in management, financial analyses and IPR.	☐ Rather limited insight in the strategic importance of the project, **or** ☐ Rather limited insight in the bottlenecks and strengths to ensure the applicability of the results, **or** ☐ Rather limited insight in the market potential or valorization path, **or** ☐ Rather limited knowledge in management, financial analyses and IPR.	☐ 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, **and** ☐ Sufficient knowledge in management, financial analyses and IPR.	☐ 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, **and** ☐ Good knowledge in management, financial analyses and IPR.
2. Engagement for valorization (including cooperation with industrial mentor)				
	☐ The candidate shows no motivation to interact with the industry or to develop complementary skills to bring the results into practice, **or** ☐ The candidate shows no sense of entrepeneurship, is not proactive and is sub-assertive, **or** ☐ It is entirely unclear how the industrial mentor will guide the candidate in the process of setting up a spin-off.	☐ The commitment of the candidate is moderate to pay enough attention to the applicability of the results and to interact actively with the industrial mentor, **or** ☐ There are still some doubts about the candidate's sense of entrepeneurship, **or** ☐ Potentially, the industrial mentor can coach the candidate in the process of setting up a spin-off, but this is not convincingly demonstrated.	☐ The candidate is clearly commited to translate the results in possible applications, **and** ☐ The candidate demonstrates entrepeneurship, is proactive and assertive, **and** ☐ There is a strong commitment of the industrial mentor to coach the candidate in the process of setting up a spin-off.	<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.

B. Project	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1. Strategic importance of the project				
	☐ 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 in order to create the spin-off. 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 the creation of a spin-off.	☐ The project approach is the best conceivable way to achieve the intended application (creation of a spin-off). The creation of the spin-off is clearly the driving force behind the research approach.
2. Size and probability of the expected valorization (in case of scientific success)				
	☐ The idea of a new spin-off is only summarily developed or stated in general terms or is hardly feasible, and/or ☐ The preparation is purely demand driven by the research teams. No meaningful interaction with the TechTransfer office has been demonstrated.	☐ The proposed creation of a new spin-off creation shows certain deficiencies or shortcomings (e.g. necessary strategic alliances are unclear or not evident).	☐ A good strategy is developed towards the creation of a new spin-off. The business concept is realistic and clear.	☐ A very solid strategy is developed towards the creation of a new spin-off, with potentially a strong position in the target market.