Template peer review medium scale: questions and score grid

Proposal registration number:
Proposal title:
Reviewer's code:

INSTRUCTIONS: You were nominated as a referee for the application of a medium-scale research infrastructure submitted to **Ghent University** and the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO, Belgium). Please complete this inquiry in English and send the completed word version by mail to [email].

This evaluation form will be provided to the members of the evaluation commission in the host institution responsible for the assessment and the ranking of all proposals submitted. Your identity will be disclosed to the commission's chair. In your comments, please do not refer to your research work or to your research group and/or institute.

Non-Disclosure Agreement
As a referee you commit yourself vis-à-vis the host Ghent University and FWO to (i) in general, preserve the most strict confidentiality as regards any information provided in this proposal and (ii) in particular, use the content of this proposal for no other means than the expert review in this application procedure.

As a referee you will not in any way share information on the evaluation, or on the information provided as part of the evaluation process with external parties. Providers of (online) services, such as online tools that use artificial intelligence, are here considered external parties. The referee must not use this information for their own purposes nor for those of any third party. This applies only to information that was not known to the referee before they assumed this role, that is not publicly available at the time the referee receives or communicates the information, that was subsequently made public unlawfully, or that was obtained unlawfully from a third party on a non-confidential basis.

Do you agree with the aforementioned non-disclosure agreement : YES/NO

fwo

GHENT UNIVERSITY

Scientific quality of the research programme that will be carried out with the RI

How is the overall scientific quality of the research programme that will be carried out with the requested research infrastructure (once the infrastructure is operational)?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	The research that will be conducted with the proposed infrastructure is highly inspiring, original and innovative, it is at the forefront of the field internationally and is highly internationally competitive. The proposed research distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research and has large impact and potential 'groundbreaking' research. The proposal demonstrates a very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies.
Very good	The research that will be conducted using the infrastructure is of very good quality and is internationally competitive. The research will answer important scientific questions and will have a great scientific impact in the respective research domain. The scientific goals of the research offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art and to ongoing research activities. The proposal for the requested infrastructure fits well with the requirements of challenging and inventive research.
Good	The research that will be conducted using the infrastructure is of good quality and will have a substantial scientific impact in the respective research domain. Not all parts of the proposal fit well with the requirements of high-risk, challenging and inventive research. The added value of the proposal to ongoing research is still reasonable but less pronounced or less well elaborated.
Average	The research that will be conducted using the infrastructure is of average quality and is at least nationally competitive. There are few indications that impact will be created in certain research areas. Improvements are needed. There is a rather limited level of scientific risks and pronounced challenges.
Below average	The proposal contains structural flaws and/or does not offer scientific added value to the international state-of-the art and to already ongoing research. The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges. The application contains some good ideas and/or opportunities but it is unlikely that the research for which the infrastructure is being used will lead to significant results because there are substantial weaknesses in the proposal. Major

	improvements would be needed to make the application competitive.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

Added value

a/ How important is the research infrastructure for the research within the scientific discipline(s) involved? To what extent does the research infrastructure contribute to important scientific, technological or societal developments including innovation and valorization potential?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	The research infrastructure is extremely crucial for the proposed research. Without the infrastructure, the steps forward in the scientific field/technological and or societal developments/innovation cannot be achieved.
Very good	The research infrastructure is very important for the proposed research. Without the infrastructure, certain steps forward in the scientific field/technological and or social developments/innovation cannot be achieved.
Good	The research infrastructure is important for the proposed research. The infrastructure provides a number of advantages to achieve certain steps forward in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation.
Average	The research infrastructure is important for only a small portion of the proposed research. The infrastructure provides a limited amount of advantages to achieve certain steps forward in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation.
Below average	The infrastructure is not sufficiently important for the proposed research and/or is of very limited use. There is only few contribution in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

b/ How important is the research infrastructure for the research policy/strategy at the University? Does the infrastructure/equipment fit the research (research policy) of the research groups: applicability, relevance, usefulness and necessity of infrastructure/equipment for the research? Is there a need or opportunity for an existing line of research, or is there an added value to be associated with filling a gap?

Score	Rationale for score
Excellent	The research infrastructure is extremely crucial for the proposed research in the research group and for the research strategy of the University. Without the infrastructure, the steps forward in the scientific field/technological and or societal developments/innovation cannot be achieved.
Very good	The research infrastructure is very important for the proposed research in the research group and for the research strategy of the University. Without the infrastructure, certain steps forward in the scientific field/technological and or social developments/innovation cannot be achieved.
Good	The research infrastructure is important for the proposed research in the research group and for the research strategy of the University. The infrastructure provides a number of advantages to achieve certain steps forward in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation.
Average	The research infrastructure is important for only a small portion of the proposed research in the research group and for the research strategy of the University. The infrastructure provides a limited amount of advantages to achieve certain steps forward in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation more quickly.
Below average	The infrastructure is not sufficiently important for the proposed research in the research group and for the research strategy of the University. There is only few contribution in the scientific domain/technological and or societal developments/innovation.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

Track record and collaboration

a/ How would you assess the scientific output and accomplishments (including policy-relevant work, technological and societal valorisation, honours and awards) of the researcher(s) submitting the proposal? Do they have the necessary experience in conducting research with and in managing research infrastructure (RI), possibly in consortium and/or in an international context?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	The applicants are or have the potential of being key opinion leader(s) in their fields and are in the best position to carry out the research and have demonstrable experience in managing RI. The scientific track record and research achievements of all included PI's and research teams is excellent and internationally recognized, and fully suited to execute the proposed research and the managing of the infrastructure.
Very good	The applicants are or have the potential of being in a very good international position and are well placed to carry out the research and have good experience (or the potential) in managing RI. The involved research teams in general give evidence of a proper scientific track record and research achievements. The available research expertise is convincing for their ability to execute the proposed infrastructure project on a proper level.
Good	The applicants have a good scientific track record and the overall expertise of the applicants is reasonably good and they are able to carry out the research and have some experience in managing RI. There are some doubts however on whether the available competence is sufficiently fitted to an optimal execution of the infrastructure proposal.
Average	The applicants have relatively limited experience in managing RI. The track record and main research achievements of some of the included researchers is less present or less competitive and their research profile is less convincing for their ability to execute the proposed infrastructure project.
Below average	The applicant(s) do not have the right expertise to carry out the research plan or to manage research infrastructures. Applicants will need to make certain career investments to conduct this research and to gain experience in managing research infrastructures.
No opinion	

Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

b/ How do you assess the necessity and relevance of the inter- and/or intra-university collaboration(s) of the involved research groups or researchers (existing collaboration, and/or interesting or new partnerships)? To what extent can the consortium be considered as 'complete' (i.e. all relevant partners are included, and no expertise is missing)? If not 'complete' or a consortium is not necessary, to what extent has this been motivated?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	The application contains a strong and coherent consortium where all relevant partners are included within and across universities with excellent disciplinary or multidisciplinary anchorage. There is a pronounced synergy between consortium partners.
Very good	The application contains a very good consortium where most of the relevant partners are included within and across universities with good disciplinary or multidisciplinary anchorage. There is complementary expertise and proper collaboration between research groups.
Good	The composition of the consortium is good but not optimal. There is potential for further expansion to other applicants and/or other disciplines within and across universities.
Average	The consortium composition is not sufficiently aligned with the requested infrastructure (e.g., lack of relevant researchers,...) and/or contains few connections within and across universities. The complementarity of the involved research groups is not well described or lacking.
Below average	The applicants did not form the right consortium to apply for this research infrastructure.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

Investment plan

a/ How is the quality of the investment plan with regard to the construction and putting into operation of the infrastructure (staff, timeline, work package, benchmarking, etc.)? Do they have a long term perspective for this infrastructure? What do they plan to do with the infrastructure when the funding comes to an end?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	All aspects of an excellent and upmost reliable investment plan are in place. The investment plan is extremely detailed with regard to the construction and putting the infrastructure into operation. The implementation will lead to an excellent and top level research infrastructure and a most reliable longer term investment. A detailed long term investment plan is in place.
Very good	All aspects of a very good and reliable investment plan are in place. The investment plan is detailed with regard to the construction and putting the infrastructure into operation. The implementation will lead to the installation of a useful research infrastructure and a reliable longer term investment. A robust long term investment plan is in place.
Good	Most aspects of a good and reliable investment plan are in place but further details of the investment plan with regard to the construction and putting the infrastructure into operation must be provided. The implementation has the potential to lead to an optimal research infrastructure. A long term investment plan is not fully worked out yet.
Average	Not all aspects of a good and reliable investment plan are in place. The investment plan is not very detailed with regard to the construction and putting the infrastructure into operation. There is no investment plan in place.
Below average	There are major shortcomings in the description of a good and reliable investment plan. The investment plan is not detailed with regard to the construction and putting the infrastructure into operation. Major improvements would be needed to strengthen the application in this area. There is no long term investment plan in place
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

b/ How is the description of the cost structure? Is the estimation of the costs, including maintenance and personnel costs, complete and correct? To what extent are the estimated costs well substantiated (e.g. different types of personnel, options for the selected devices)?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	All aspects of an excellent and upmost reliable cost structure are in place. The necessary estimations are present regarding the costs of research infrastructure (i.e. maintenance and personnel). No difficulties are to be expected in terms of cost structure while executing the plans.
Very good	Most aspects of a very good and reliable cost structure are in place. The necessary estimations are present regarding the costs of research infrastructure (i.e. maintenance and personnel). No major difficulties are to be expected in terms of cost structure while executing the plans.
Good	Most aspects of a good and reliable cost structure are in place. Some necessary estimations are present regarding the costs of research infrastructure (i.e., maintenance and personnel). Improvements are needed but concerns can be met.
Average	Not all aspects of a good and reliable cost structure are in place. Estimations are not always present regarding the cost infrastructure (i.e., maintenance and personnel) and improvements are needed.
Below average	There are major shortcomings in the description of a good and reliable cost structure for the research infrastructure. Major improvements would be needed to strengthen the application in this area.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

c/ How is the relevance and completeness of the utilization plan: In what context will the infrastructure/equipment be operated and who can use it? How open is the access policy? Are there opportunities for internal and external collaboration and valorization? Will this infrastructure/equipment be optimally used or not?

	Rationale for score
Excellent	All aspects of an excellent and reliable utilization plan are in place. The necessary experience is present in the consortium regarding the utilization of research infrastructure. The implementation of the plan will lead to an optimal usage of the infrastructure. An access plan is available for internal and external users.
Very good	Most aspects of a good and reliable utilization plan are in place. Most of the necessary experience is present in the consortium regarding the utilization of research infrastructure. Implementation of the plan will lead to a good usage of the infrastructure. Possible shortcomings are minimal. Access to internal and external usage is possible but less visible.
Good	Not all aspects of a good and reliable utilization plan are in place. Experience in research infrastructure utilization is somewhat present. Improvements are needed but concerns can be met. Only an internal access strategy is available.
Average	There are shortcomings in the description of a good and reliable utilization plan. Experience in the utilization of research infrastructure is limited. Major improvements would be needed to strengthen the application in this area. An access strategy and plan is not available.
Below average	There are major shortcomings in the description of a good and reliable utilization plan. Experience in the utilization of research infrastructure is weak. Major improvements would be needed to strengthen the application in this area. An access strategy and plan is not available.
No opinion	
Insufficient knowledge	This application does not provide sufficient information on which a judgement can be based.

Score:

Comments:

SWOT

Please summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Strenghts

Weaknesses

Opportunities

Threats

Any other comments