

Score grid for the EOS pre-proposal

1. EOS consortium (40%)							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
Scientific capacity of individual participants of the EOS consortium							
Taking the scientific seniority into account, this criterion assesses to what extent the individual participants of a particular EOS consortium have the necessary or adequate competences (i.e. knowledge and skills) for the proposed EOS research project.							
The included individual researchers lack the inherent competences required to perform the proposed research. A collaborative approach will not compensate for this.	Some of the included individual researchers do not possess the necessary competences to carry out the research in a good way. It can be expected that a collaborative approach will not compensate for this.	Not all included researchers are sufficiently skilled or knowledgeable. However, if the consortium is well composed, it could compensate for this.		In general, all the included individual researchers are (very) competent researchers with good to very good skills and knowledge to execute the proposed research. If the consortium is well composed, it will have a leverage effect and allow remarkable achievement by the consortium.		All (or most) included individual researchers are internationally recognized experts. The scientific capacity with respect to the proposed research of each included individual researcher is outstanding. .	
Composition and motivation of the EOS consortium							
This criterion assesses the added value of the proposed EOS consortium?.							
The EOS consortium is not adequately composed at all and will not succeed in obtaining the targeted research objectives.	The EOS consortium is poorly composed casting serious doubt on whether the EOS consortium will be successful in executing the proposed research. . Key expertise is lacking. The complementarity of each included research group is not well described or lacking.	The EOS consortium is reasonably composed and its members will probably be able to implement the proposed research. However, the composition is not optimal as some expertise is either lacking or overrepresented. The composition of the EOS consortium is not clearly described nor well motivated to be fully convincing.		The EOS consortium composition is (very) solid . The EOS consortium will be able to execute the proposed research, as all the necessary expertise is present in a complementary manner to implement the proposed research. The composition of the EOS consortium is clearly described and (very) well motivated.		The EOS consortium is a perfectly balanced team in which each team member has a key role to play in the execution of the proposed research activities. All the required expertise is present in the most optimal way, with a pronounced synergy between the researchers.	

2. EOS project (60%)							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>Proposed research idea</p> <p>With regard to the state-of-the-art, is the proposed research idea clear, innovative, original and timely? To what extent will the EOS project generate knowledge that contributes to the state-of-the-art?</p>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is poorly written, unclear and/or contains mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The targeted research goals are not original at all, the project does not build upon the international state-of-the-art. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research has been studied before and will as such not offer any added value to the state-of-the-art. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale and hypothesis are completely lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As written, the pre-proposal is unclear or contains some mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The targeted research goals are not very original and their innovative character is limited. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planned research activities will not result in much added value for the domain, but are rather a catching up with respect to the international state-of-the-art. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale and hypothesis are somehow lacking and/or rather weak. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As written, the pre-proposal is reasonably clear and does not contain mistakes/conceptual misunderstandings. Some aspects of project are original. <p><u>BUT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted research goals are primarily incremental according to the current state-of-the-art. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale and hypothesis are present, however, not sufficiently convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pre-proposal is clear and brings interesting evidences regarding the project. The targeted research goals are timely, innovative and original. The scientific objectives offer a substantial added value relative to the state of the art. The rationale is strong, the hypothesis is clear and both build upon the international state-of-the-art in a sound manner (leap of knowledge). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is well written, timely and addresses important challenges. It is unique, extremely original, and it distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research efforts at the international level. It is a pioneering project based on a ground-breaking rationale and challenging objectives that go beyond the state-of-the-art. The project has a very high potential to generate knowledge that goes well beyond the state-of-the-art thereby setting new standards within the field. 			
<p>Proposed research approach: methodological aspects and feasibility</p> <p>How convincing is the research and methodological approach? Does the EOS pre-proposal propose to use state-of-the-art methodology? Does the project seem feasible?</p>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach and/or key methodology is lacking. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research approach, and/or methodology are not adequate at all to execute the proposed research. The project is as such not feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is not clear. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the methodological aspects are not suited to execute the proposed research. Reaching the proposed research goal(s) is as such not feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach seems reasonable. <p><u>BUT</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks key elements and contains some shortcomings in the research and/or methodological approach. The feasibility of the project is as such hard to judge or doubtful. <p><u>AND/OR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodological choices could have been more innovative compared to the state-of-the-art. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is convincing. The proposed methodology is relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives, resulting in a feasible project. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings in the proposed research approach and methodology. Some aspects are (very) innovative from a methodological standpoint and compared to the state-of-the-art. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is very convincing. Based on the international standards, the proposed methodology is the most relevant, efficient and effective to reach the scientific goals. The project is feasible. The methodology is considered state-of-the-art state-of-the-art or beyond in the domain. 			