

# Belmont Forum International Opportunities Fund

## Proposal Evaluation Form

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

If after reading the proposal, you feel that you have a conflict of interest, as identified in the **Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration**, please notify the **Call Program Office**.

Reference No. of proposal:.....

Name of Leading Principal Investigator:.....

### 1. Quality/Intellectual Merit

- *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the goals and objectives of the joint research plan*
- *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*

How well does the activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?

Does the proposal contribute to scientific excellence and significant progress toward the state of the art?

To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts?

If these partnerships currently exists what does this new funding allow them to do that they could not do otherwise?

What is the added value of the international cooperation? Where appropriate this should also include the extent to which Partner Organizations' existing investments are leveraged in the proposed project.

The excellence of this proposal has been demonstrated:

- A**       **A-**       **B**       **B-**       **C**  
 Fully      Very well      Well      Adequately      Not at all

### 2. User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts

- *Engagement of research users (relevant policy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities or industry) and effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*
- *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related , economical*

What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society, policy-development or economies? How have users being engaged and how effective are the proposed mechanisms for knowledge transfer to decision makers?

Does the research collaboration focus on global challenges for which solutions can only be achieved by global scientific approaches?

User engagement and potential impact has been demonstrated:

- A**       **B**       **C**  
 Fully      Adequately      Not at all

### 3. Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium

- *Collaboration between natural and social sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
- *Competence and expertise of teams and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*

How strong is the collaboration between the natural and social sciences? Is the collaboration between natural and social sciences necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed research?

How well qualified are the proposers (Leading Principal Investigator and team) in terms of science knowledge, expertise and experience to conduct the project?

What is the quality of previous work in terms of past or potential contributions to, and impact on the proposed and other areas of research?

Is the Leading Principal Investigator team (including any identified Co-Principal Investigators) able to lead the project, e.g. having strong management and leadership skills, or having complementarity of expertise and synergy of the members of the team?

Level of trans-disciplinarity, and of applicants' track record and ability to deliver this has been demonstrated:

**A**  
Fully

**B**  
Adequately

**C**  
Not at all

### 4. Resources and Management

- *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
- *Balanced cooperation*

How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is the coordination plan adequate?

Is there an operational plan with well defined milestones in place? Is there sufficient access to resources?

Are the requested investments well justified and relevant?

Are the scientific and financial contributions of the partners from each country well balanced?

The level of planning and justification of resources has been demonstrated:

**A**  
Fully

**B**  
Adequately

**C**  
Not at all

### 5. Overall Assessment

Please summarize your view of the proposal.

- A** This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria.
- A-** This is a strong proposal that meets all assessment criteria well.
- B** This is a very good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses.
- B-** This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with a number of minor weaknesses.
- C** This proposal does not meet a significant number of assessment criteria and/or is scientifically or technically flawed