

Score grid for 2nd COVID-19 call

Score Criterion	D (Non-competitive/weak)	C (Fair/acceptable)	B (Good)	A (Very good)	A+ (Outstanding)
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Necessity and urgency of the research (including the ability to conduct this research during this phase of the pandemic), its contribution to the intended solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic ! This criterion counts double !	* There is no necessity and urgency to perform the project now. - or * The project fits in other structural funding channels. - or * The project proposal is clearly ill-timed: it is clear that the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic or its studied consequences does not allow conducting the research (in Flanders). - or * There is a mismatch between the project execution and the solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic.	* The necessity and urgency to perform the project now is less pronounced. - or * The timing of the project proposal is suboptimal. There is evidence that the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic or its studied consequences will hinder the execution of important parts of the project (in Flanders). - or * The project approach is only partially relevant for the intended solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic.	* The necessity and urgency to perform the project is acceptable. - or * There is some reservation on the timing of the project proposal. There is evidence that the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic or its studied consequences will somewhat hinder the execution of parts of the project. - or * The research approach offers a relevant strategic added value for the realisation of the intended solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic.	* The necessity and urgency to perform the project is high. - or * The project proposal is timely. It may be anticipated that the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic or its studied consequences match perfectly with conducting this research during this phase of the pandemic. - and * The research approach offers a relevant strategic added value for the realisation of the intended solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic.	* The necessity and urgency to perform the project is high. - and * The project proposal is timely. It may be anticipated that the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic or its studied consequences match perfectly with conducting this research during this phase of the pandemic). - and * The research approach offers a relevant strategic added value for the realisation of the intended solution and societal implementability / impact in the short to medium term for managing the societal consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. - The intended applications are clearly the driving force behind the implementation approach.
2. Added value to state-of-art and clear synergy and complementarity with ongoing (inter)national initiatives	* The proposal contains structural flaws or offers no added value to the international state-of-the-art or ongoing (inter)national initiatives. - or * There is no synergy or complementarity with ongoing (inter)national	- The added value to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research or ongoing (inter)national initiatives is limited or insufficiently elaborated in the application. - or * There is only very limited synergy or complementarity with ongoing (inter)national initiatives.	* The added value to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research is less pronounced. - or * Synergy and complementarity with ongoing (inter)national initiatives is less pronounced.	* The scientific goals build upon and offer substantial added value to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research. - or * The proposal has a clear synergy and complementarity with other initiatives such that, if successful, it has the potential to highly accelerate (inter)national research initiatives.	* The proposal is highly innovative and unique. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from the current state-of-art at the international level. - and * The proposal has a clear synergy and complementarity with other initiatives such that, if successful, it has the potential to highly accelerate (inter)national research

Score grid Covid-19 call II 2020

	initiatives.				initiatives.
2. Quality of the research (research approach, methodology, work plan, budget)	* The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach or not substantiated. - or * It is insufficiently substantiated how the scientific goals will be realized. - or * The project planning is unrealistic, not substantiated or absent. - or * Reaching any of the scientific goals is evaluated as unrealistic within the project boundaries.	* The research approach is characterised by serious flaws or shortcomings. Structural adjustments are needed in order to reach the scientific goals. - or * The project planning is flawed and needs structural adjustments. - or * Most scientific goals are unlikely to be reached within the project or are not formulated clearly enough to allow full assessment. - or * There is an important imbalance between the research workload and the requested level of person power and resources.	* The approach contains some gaps or superfluous activities in attainment of the scientific goals. - or * The project planning contains minor inconsistencies or is in need of small adjustments. - or * It is likely that the scientific goals will be partly reached. - or * The level of requested resources is acceptable provided that the project budget is moderately adjusted.	* The research approach is substantiated, and suited to the realization of the scientific goals. - and * The project planning is suitable. - and * The scientific goals are challenging but realistic, and mostly reachable within the project. - and * There is a good balance between the research workload and the requested level of resources.	* The research approach is well substantiated, and fully matched to the realization of the scientific goals. - and * The project planning is well elaborated. - and * The scientific goals are challenging but accurate, and fully reachable within the project. - and * There is a good balance between the research workload and the requested level of resources.
3. Expertise and track record of the consortium (also in view of the immediate start of the project)	* Essential research expertise is lacking in order to be able to execute the proposed research within the foreseen timing.	* Important modifications are needed to the composition of the consortium in order to carry out the research project. - or * A considerable lag time is expected before research activities can be initiated	* The overall expertise is acceptable but there are some particular concerns or shortcomings to allow the optimal execution of the project. * There is some reservation as to whether the research activities may be initiated immediately	* There is no doubt that the proposed research activities can start promptly - and * The available research competence and track record is very good but the synergy within the consortium is less pronounced. - or * The available research competence and track record is sufficient but the synergy within the consortium is very well pronounced.	* There is no doubt that the proposed research activities can start promptly - and * The available research competence and track record is excellent. Key partners of the consortium are "top level" research performers in the international context - and * The synergy and integration between the consortium partners is also very pronounced. The proposal involves a meaningful and essential research cooperation.