



SCRIMM

STRUCTURAL COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH IN MILITARY MEDICINE

General Instructions for SEC Members:

The SEC discussions will be based on a presentation of 15 minutes by the applicants. Remark: SEC members should have taken note of the content of the proposals before the SEC meeting. SEC members will then have the opportunity to ask additional questions to the applicants (Q&A session – 20-25 minutes). The applicants will assist in the meeting for the presentation and Q&A session of their proposal only. Each proposal is followed by a deliberation (10 minutes) by the SEC members. Each SEC will classify the full proposals into a SEC Funding Scenario according to specific criteria: Complementarities and/or overlaps between proposals; coherence of the proposals with the strategic objectives (scope) of the themes; cohesion of the partnership; general appreciation of the presentation by the applicants. After the presentations of the applicants, experts may comment and ask their questions. It is however recommended to prepare a few relevant questions prior to the SEC, based on the proposals and related documents. This allows for a smooth continuation in case no immediate questions arise from the presentation.

The SEC Funding Scenario is a report (pdf document) per theme, which classifies proposals as 'Recommended' or 'Not recommended' for funding and justifies this classification.

•Recommended for funding: high quality proposals that must be funded, if budget allows.

•Not recommended for funding: proposals of insufficient quality, which must not be funded.

The SEC will list the proposals that are recommended for funding by order of preference for funding.

This document is addressed to the Scientific Committee of the RHID who will use it to elaborate the Scientific Committee Funding Scenario. The SEC Funding Scenario enables the Scientific Committee of the RHID to understand the ranking and make an insightful selection of projects. It is also an opportunity for the SEC to include recommendations in terms of adjustments beneficial for the project implementation.

Section	Description	Paragraph	Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
1. PROJECT SCOPE & OBJECTIVES	[2 pages] Define the problem by describing the questions and difficulties to be resolved by this project. Briefly outline the solution that is proposed in this project. Describe the present (inter)national state of the art in the project field (based on literature) and cite relevant literature. If the applicants are already active in the project field, give an overview of the results achieved so far. Indicate any interfaces with other current projects led by the project team members.	1.1. Project scope & objectives Are the project objectives clear and coherent? Does the proposal provide an accurate overview of the state of the art?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The research objectives are unclear AND contradictory. The proposal has overlooked the essential scientific state of the art in the domain.	The research objectives are badly defined OR do not align with each other. The proposal has important flaws regarding the state of the art.	The research objectives are mostly clear and sufficiently aligned. The proposal demonstrates an average knowledge of the state of the art in the domain, without critical omissions.	The research objectives are clear and align with each other and they are well defined. The proposal shows a good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are superfluous or minimal.	The research objectives are fully and exceptionally well described with an outstanding alignment and they are perfectly defined. The proposal shows an exhaustive knowledge of the state of the art in the domain.
2. WORK PLAN	[Max 1 page/WP] Describe how the research project will be tackled and justify why this approach was selected and why any specific strategic choices were made. The approach should clarify how the project goals will be achieved. Based on the global approach, describe the structure and relationship between the work packages. Provide a description of the project in terms of work packages, tasks, and deliverables in accordance with the GANTT chart. For a clinical trial, describe the following aspects as separate subtitles: design of the clinical trial, hypotheses that will be investigated, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sample size calculation, statistical analysis plan, centres that will be involved and/or that already agreed to participate, recruitment rate and expected drop-out. Refer to: •Number and title of Work Package, •Number, title and timing of tasks, task leader •Timing of deliverables •Number of person-months for each task •Means, tools, procedures, techniques to carry out the tasks Notes: •The work plan must be detailed to the level of work packages (WP) and tasks (Tasks). •You may add as many WP, Tasks and Deliverables as required by the project. It is not mandatory to have a Deliverable for each task. •Work packages or tasks necessary for the implementation of the project but not financed by Defence must also be described and added to the GANTT chart.	2.1. Relation of the work packages to the proposal objectives	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal does not provide a clear work plan, hampering the realization of the project	The work plan raises doubts on the successful implementation of several aspects of the project	The work plan sufficiently enables to apprehend the objectives of the project, leaving room for improvement (shortcomings and/or redundancies are present)	The work plan correctly enables to apprehend the objectives of the project leaving some room for improvement (minor shortcomings and/or redundancies are present)	The work plan outstandingly enables to apprehend all the objectives of the project with neither redundancies nor shortcomings
	Complete the GANTT chart in accordance with the description of the detailed work plan, tasks and deliverables above.	2.2. Work planning and time schedule: GANTT chart	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The work planning is not feasible to appropriately run the project	The work planning is not sufficiently adequate or sufficiently elaborated. Structural improvements are needed	The work planning is elaborated in a reasonable way, but contains some gaps or shortcomings and leaves room for improvement	The work planning is elaborated in a well-thought manner, allowing for minor improvements regarding efficiency, integration and synergy within the tasks	The work planning is elaborated in an efficient and cost effective way, clearly focused on reaching a high level of integration and synergy within the tasks
	•Work intensity of each partner within each task (expressed in person-month [PM]) •Include for each partner the person-months funded by the project and the person-months funded by other sources (see notes). Make sure that these data correspond with the data filled in the budget sheet Notes: •Person-month [PM] = 1 full-time equivalent [FTE] •Other sources of financing may include: salary payment by institutions other than Defence and/or via other projects, voluntary contributions, interns, students... •Valorisation / Dissemination / Exploitation	2.3. Workload intensity in relation to the work packages: GANTT chart (consult the GANTT chart, filled out by the applicants) Provide an overall assessment of the requested level of person-power of each partner throughout the work packages and tasks (vertical lecture of the GANTT chart, with recommendations regarding the intensity of their activities and pertinence of participation in them).	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	There is an unacceptable discrepancy between the workload and the investment (person-power) of the partners	The work repartition among partners is not sufficiently justified by the tasks; the requested level of person-power calls for major adjustments	There is a reasonable work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power calls for some adjustments	There is a more than appropriate work repartition among the partners; the requested level of person-power may call for minor adjustments	All partners have very fine-tuned, pertinent and cost-effective work efforts throughout work packages and tasks
	[3 pages] Translate the research objectives into a methodology (used methods, techniques, systems and/or way of working) in order to achieve the results: •The division of the project into phases •The organisation of the project team •The technologies used •Detail the results your approach will enable to gather (expected outcomes): •Take possible ethical issues into account if relevant	2.4. Coherence between research objectives and methodology Assess the chosen methodology (taking into account the different disciplines mobilised), use of data, the articulation of the objectives-methodology-expected outcomes.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The methodology and use of data are unclear or inappropriate.	The methodology and use of data have shortcomings and/or lacks details.	The methodology and use of data are sufficient. The objectives, methodology and expected outcomes form a coherent and reasonable unit, but contain some gaps or shortcomings	The methodology and use of data are elaborate, well matched to the objectives and expected outcomes. There is room for minor improvement	The methodology and use of data are outstanding and it ensures a perfect match to the objectives and outcomes, and leaves little to no room for improvement

Section	Description	Paragraph	Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
	Number, identify and explain the main (max 10) incurring risks that could delay or hinder the project. Locate the number of each risk in terms of its likelihood of occurrence and impact on the project.	2.5. Risk assessment of the project How well are the risks evaluated by the applicants? Do they provide an adequate 'fall-back' plan, if needed?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal does not provide a clear view of possible major risks and/or feasible contingency plans	Important risks are overlooked and/or contingency plans are not sufficiently realistic	Adequate assessment of the major risks and reasonable contingency plans	Exhaustive assessment of the risks and good preventive contingency plans	Outstanding assessment of the risks and excellent preventive outline of solutions and alternatives
	Complete the Budget File (Full proposal cost template; available on the submission platform) taking into account the budget rules explained under section 3.7 of the information document . Make sure that the number of person-months indicated in the Gantt chart correspond to the number of person-months in the cost template.	2.6. Budget assessment Is the budget realistic, well-balanced among partners (if applicable), and in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project?	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The budget severely overestimates or underestimates fundamental needs of the project, and/or is not in line with its objectives and/or expected outcomes	The budget partially overestimates or underestimates fundamental needs of the project, and/or is not well aligned with its objectives and/or expected outcomes	The budget correctly estimates the fundamental needs of the project, leaving some room for adjustments; it is adequately aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget correctly estimates all the needs of the project, only leaving room for very minor adjustments; it is very well aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project	The budget is extremely well-thought and optimized. It perfectly estimates all the needs of the project and takes into account the post-project. It perfectly aligns with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project
3. IMPACT, DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN & ETHICS ASSESSMENT	[1/2 page] Explain the potential impact of the project (its methodologies, processes, technologies, developments, outcomes, insights, ...) and how the project contributes to each of the Defence's R&T strategic objectives as described in the information document (section 2.1.) in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •translational potential •capability development (a capability being the ability to perform actions to achieve desired objectives/effects, not limited to equipment, but also doctrine, training, ...) •filling of employment gaps and/or job creation •marketable products •optimisation of Defence processes (a process being the series of actions or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end, e.g. procurement process; innovation process ...) 	3.1. Potential impact of the proposal and contribution to defence's R&T strategic objectives Assess the potential impact of the project and its contribution to Defence's R&T strategic objectives & its translational potential.	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal fails to address the project's impact. It is very doubtful that the project will be able to contribute to Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal fails to address the project's impact. The project's contribution to Defence's R&T strategic objectives is described and correctly linked, but not enough to be clearly relevant	The proposal addresses the project's principal impact. The project will be a relevant contribution to one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal rightly describes the project's impact. The project will be a relevant contribution to more than one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives	The proposal outstandingly describes the project's impact. The project will be a very relevant contribution to more than one of Defence's R&T strategic objectives
	[2 pages] <u>Plans to maximise the impact of the project:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Explain the concrete plans of publications (number of publications that are expected, target group, target date) valorisation, dissemination, and exploitation of the project results to Defence, in accordance with the WP valorisation and GANTT chart and the expected impact. •Explain the concrete plans of dissemination of the project results to Defence, in accordance with the WP valorisation and GANTT chart and the expected impact. Describe the planned measures to maximise the impact of your project by providing a first version of your 'plan for dissemination'. Describe the dissemination and communication measures that are planned, and the target group(s) addressed (e.g. scientific community, end users, financial actors...). •Are there possible follow-on projects for this proposal, either going deeper or with a broader scope? •Is there a link with other (inter)national projects or networks? 	3.2. Plans to maximise the impact of the project (dissemination and valorisation of results) Assess the capacity of promoting results and knowledge and enabling publication, dissemination and exploitation of data; the adequacy of the targeted audiences, the appropriateness of communication tools and approaches, ...	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal offers very poor strategy for valorising and disseminating its results	The proposal outlines valorization and disseminating strategies which contain significant gaps or shortcomings. No efforts are made to promote and distribute results	The valorisation plans are sufficiently described; they allow promoting results and enable publication. The appropriate communication tools and approaches are used, but activities are somewhat limited in terms of approaching different targets	The valorisation plans are well described and offer considerable variety in terms of dissemination activities for different targets, using original communication tools and approaches leading to a good transfer and/or utilization of results	The valorisation plans are fully described and offer an original and ambitious strategy to captivate its targets and generate high interest about its results. There is a link with another regional / federal / international project, or ambition for follow-on (deeper or broader) projects based on its findings
	[2 pages] Please describe in detail the <u>data management plan</u> (DMP). The DMP should answer the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Will data be collected, reused and/or generated? •How will you handle legal issues? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oWill the project use / process / store personal data? If your answer is 'YES': shortly describe the kind of personal data. oWill the work undertaken in the project possibly result in research data with potential for technology transfer and valorisation? If yes, your proposal must take into account possible intellectual property issues. oWho will be the owner of the data? oWill the work undertaken in the project possibly use or generate classified information? •How will you document your data? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oWill metadata standards be used? •Data storage and backup during the project: where will the data be stored (i.e. the partner's Research Storage or other)? •Data preservation in the long term - after the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oWill all data be preserved in the long term (at least 10 years)? oWhere will the data be archived? oHow will data security and protection of sensitive data be taken care in the long term? Are there any expected related costs?	3.3. Data management plan and availability of generated data after the research is finalised Assess the quality of the data management plan and the availability of the generated data for Defence	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The proposal has no plan to make the data available after the research is finalised	The data management plan containing significant shortcomings or gaps	The data management plan follows basic standards in making the generated data available	The data management plan follows good standards, making the data easily available	There is an excellent data management plan in line with the highest standards to enable easy re-use of the data
	[2 pages] All projects must perform an evaluation of the ethical aspects of the research that will be undertaken. It is recommended to consult the Ethical Board of your organisation before submitting a proposal.	3.4. Research ethics evaluation	This part of the proposal will not be evaluated by the remote evaluators nor by the Scientific Experts Committee. The Ethical Advisory Board of the RHID will assess this information and can advise the partnership how to deal with the ethical aspects of its proposal and formulate concerns, advice, preventive and/or corrective measures for specific ethical aspects.					

Section	Description	Paragraph	Insufficient information	Deficient	Weak	Reasonable	Good	Excellent
4. QUALITY OF THE PARTNER(S)/PARTNERSHIP	<p>[1 page per partner] [Research institutes (public or private non-profit)] Provide a description of expertise and skills for each partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Their professional background - Maximum 10 top publications relevant for the proposal (indicate clearly the international peer reviewed publications) - A list of the research projects carried out over the past five years in the topic of the call or related areas (specify the duration of the work and funding source). - A list of their (inter)national contacts and the (inter)national networks to which they belong within the context of the proposal. - The scientific quality, management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator. - If possible, include web links for all the information above. 	<p>4.1. [Research institutes (public or private non-profit)] Individual quality of the partner(s) Assess the quality of the individual partners within the frame of the project. Competence regarding project management and coordination of work packages should be taken into account, including management, synthesis and communication skills of the coordinator.</p>	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partner(s) do(es) not possess the experience and expertise to perform the proposed research	The partner(s) cannot be considered as (a) reliable and promising partner(s) for the project due to insufficient research experience or expertise to contribute in a suitable way	The partner(s) possess(es) enough experience and expertise to perform the research in a suitable way	The partner(s) is an/are acknowledged expert(s) in their fields, who can perform the research competently	The partner(s) is/are well established in their research field and can be considered to be highly reliable, competent and fit perfectly for this project
	<p>[1/2 page] The different dimensions of the added value in a partnership can be seen as (non-exhaustive list):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complementarity of expertise among supervisors & members •Complementarity of disciplines and way of working (multi, inter) to properly cover the project objectives •Long term perspective on collaboration: can this project be the starting point for a broadened or intensified collaboration? 	<p>4.2. Argue the motivation of choosing the supervising committee in addressing the topic of the proposal. Assess the adequacy of the partnership/supervising committee as reasoned by the applicants in relation to the project objectives</p>	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	The partnership fails to address the different network dimensions (like complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership has not taken into account essential network dimensions (like complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration), hindering the realisation of the project	The partnership is sufficiently balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution), for the project to be feasible	The partnership is well balanced in terms of the different dimensions (including complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution), bringing an added value to the proposal	The partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of all the different dimensions (including complementarity of expertise and way of working, long term perspective on collaboration, added value of the in-kind contribution) , bringing a high added value to the proposal
	<p>[1/2 page] (e.g.: Degree issued awarded in a NATO nation, language knowledge, ...). Argue the motivation of choosing this profile in addressing the topic of the proposal. Additional competencies requested and brief description of the selection process.</p>	<p>4.3. Describe the profile of the PhD-candidate you would hire and define the eligibility criteria you would use</p>	Given the lack of information, this criterion cannot be evaluated	No criteria are set except the ones requested by the university	Criteria for selection are vague but are considered by the applicants	Criteria are defined for the selection of the PhD candidate do exist but remain broad	Candidate profile is described and a specific profile is provided where eg the type of degree (PE, MD, PT..) is defined	Candidate profile is extensively described and a specific profile with experience in the domain is provided