

Guidelines for Applicants

The Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO)
The Fonds de recherche du Québec (FRQ)

SUMMARY	CONTACTS
COMPETITION YEAR: 2026	<p><u>FWO:</u> dr. Gregory Absillis Science Policy Advisor International Affairs T +32 2 550 15 29 Gregory.Absillis@fwo.be</p> <p><u>FRQ:</u> Leslie Walsh Program Officer T +1-418-643-8560, ext. 3457 programmes.internationaux@frq.gouv.qc.ca</p>
<p>APPLICATION DEADLINE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 18, 2026 - 5:00 PM Brussels Time for MAIN APPLICATION submitted to FWO E-loket by Flemish PI. • June 18, 2026 - 4:00 PM Montreal Time for ADMINISTRATIVE FORM submitted to FRQnet by the Québec PI. 	
<p>AMOUNT: Up to \$100,000/year for Québec teams Up to €85,000/year per project for Flanders</p>	
<p>PROJECT DURATION: 3 years</p>	
<p>RESULTS ANNOUNCEMENT: December 2026</p>	

1. BACKGROUND

This fifth joint Call for Proposals is part of a rich and continuous collaboration between the Fonds de recherche du Québec (FRQ) and the [Research Foundation - Flanders, Belgium \(Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen, or “FWO”\)](#). It has been implemented through the Bilateral Québec-Flanders Research Cooperation Program since 2013.

The [FWO](#) supports fundamental research, strategic basic research, as well as research infrastructure in the Flemish speaking community, stimulates international cooperation and promotes equal opportunities.

The [FRQ](#) ensures the strategic and coherent development of research in Québec and provides financial support for it, supports the training of the next generation of researchers and research excellence, establishes the partnerships necessary to fulfill its mission, supports knowledge mobilization, and promotes research and science in French, all across the sectors of natural sciences and engineering, health sciences, social sciences and humanities, and arts and letters.

2. OBJECTIVES

This program aims to contribute to (1) the excellence of research in Flanders and Québec and (2) to the development of scientific cooperation by financially supporting **interdisciplinary collaborative research projects between both research communities, involving at least two of the three sectors of the FRQ**. For further information on interdisciplinarity as it relates to this Program, please refer to Section 5.2 ‘Evaluation criteria’ below.

This Call is open to all scientific domains and only funds fundamental research.

3. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

3.1. Eligible Proposals

To be eligible, the proposal must comply with the following:

- The proposal must involve a minimum of two research teams, one in Québec and one in Flanders. See below for the eligibility requirements for candidates.
- Research projects should be carried out both in Québec and in Flanders, for a duration of 3 (three) years.
- Flemish applicants are subject to the [regulations on FWO research projects](#).
- Québec applicants are subject to the FRQ’s [Common General Rules](#) and FRQ policies such as the [FRQ Open Access Policy for the Dissemination of Research](#) (available in French only).
- **Please note that Québec and Flemish researchers may participate in only one project as submitted under this call.**
- **Deadline for proposals:**
 - **June 18, 2026 - 5:00 PM Brussels Time** for **MAIN APPLICATION** submitted to **FWO E-loket** by the Flemish PI.
 - **June 18, 2026 - 4:00 PM Montreal Time** for **ADMINISTRATIVE FORM** submitted to **FRQnet** by the Québec PI.

For more information on the application process see section 4 'Application Submission'. **If a proposal is submitted only in one country and/or received after the deadline it is ipso facto ineligible.**

3.2. Eligible applicants

In Québec:

Only researchers affiliated with Québec university establishments recognized by the FRQ are eligible to apply for funding from the FRQ. Québec applicants must comply with the following eligibility requirements in effect at the time of application for funding and for the duration of the grant:

Québec team composition: The Québec team must include at least two 2 researchers, as follows:

- One eligible Principal Investigator (or "Supervisor-Spokesperson" in the FWO form), AND
- At least one co-investigator (or "Co-supervisor" in the FWO form) that is Status 1 (university researcher) or 2 (clinical university researcher) as defined in the [Common General Rules](#).

These two researchers must not be retired.

Principal Investigator (PI): The PI from Québec (or "Supervisor-Spokesperson" in the FWO form) will be in charge of managing the funding provided by the FRQ. To be eligible for funding, the Québec PI must meet status 1 (university researcher) or 2 (clinical university researcher) as defined in the [Common General Rules](#).

Researchers who meet RGC status 1 (and 2) requirements but hold a non-tenure track position at their university must provide a letter from their academic institution (see below for more details).

Other co-investigator(s) (CI): Additional CIs (or "Co-supervisors" in the FWO form) may be added to the Quebec team, but are not mandatory. To be eligible as an additional CI, the CI must meet Status 1, 2 or 3 as defined in the FRQ's [Common General Rules](#).

University researchers who hold a non-tenure track position may join the team as an additional CI, provided they have a university affiliation that allows them to supervise students on their own. In such cases, CIs must attach a letter from their institution to the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#) form (see section 4.3).

Submission of an administrative form in the FRQnet Electronic Portfolio: The Quebec PI must submit a separate and short administrative form in the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#). See section 4.2 for details.

In Flanders:

- Eligible host institutions: Your research will be carried out under the supervision of an applicable Flemish principle (main) host institution defined in article 7§2 of the [regulations research projects fundamental research](#). Where appropriate, the principal (main) host institutions from article 7§2 can carry out their research in collaboration with a Flemish or Federal scientific institution, but not in collaboration with a non-Flemish research institution other than those in Québec, eligible for funding at FRQ.
- Eligible (co-)supervisor(s): Your research project will be carried out under the direction of a supervisor per host institution, possibly in collaboration with one or more co-supervisors in line with Article 10 (except §4 till §6 - there is no division into junior and senior projects in this call) and Article 11 (except §3) of the [regulations research projects fundamental research](#).
- **In the framework of this call with Québec, you can only act once as a principle investigator (supervisor) or co-investigator (co-supervisor).**
- Applications submitted in the frame of this FWO-FRQ project call are not taken into account in for the maximum of one project per application round for which you may act as (co-)supervisor, nor are they taken into account for the maximum of two projects applied for and ongoing on the start date of the newly allocated project.

3.3. *Eligible expenses*

In Québec:

The Québec part of the project budget can only be used as described in the FRQ's [Common General Rules](#) (Section 8). Please note that the Québec side of each application may receive up to \$100,000 CAD per year for three years; the requested budget therefore must not exceed this amount.

Indirect costs of research (ICR) will also be paid directly to managing institutions. The ICR will equal 27% of the grant awarded and will be in addition to the grant amount.

In Flanders:

The Flemish part of the project budget can only be used for one or more of the following cost categories:

- Scientific staff and consumables. The type of costs that can be requested under "Consumables" can be found in the [project regulations](#), Art 27, §1. Each party is responsible to cover its own travel and accommodation costs in the framework of this joint project. As such, only travel and accommodation costs of Flemish researchers going to Québec can be budgeted on the FWO side. Travel insurance is the responsibility of the person traveling and should be arranged and claimed in accordance with the policies and procedures of the Flemish host institution of the person traveling. If the Flemish host institution of the person traveling does not cover such an insurance, related costs can be budgeted as a consumable.
- Equipment.

On the Flemish side the following budget regulations apply in the frame of this bilateral collaboration with Québec:

- The total project budget for staff and consumables may not exceed 85.000 EUR/year;
- The budget for staff and consumables of the Flemish main host institution must be minimally 45.000 EUR/year;
- Per project a maximum amount of 150.000 EUR for equipment can be applied for. This can take the form of matching funding.

No overhead costs must be charged on the Flemish budgets.

4. SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION

New for the 2026 Call: In addition to the main submission at FWO by the Flemish supervisor-spokesperson, the Québec PI must submit a separate, administrative application form in the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#). See section 4.2 for more details.

4.1. Main application form – submitted on the FWO online platform E-loket

The proposal is to be designed jointly by Québec and Flemish research team(s). One joint main application form has to be completed and submitted by the Flemish PI through the FWO online platform '[E-loket](#)'. The Flemish PI has to consult their Québec partner to jointly complete the application to make sure that both FWO and FRQ provisional funding related activities are included.

No application received after the deadline (June 18th, 2026 - 5:00 PM Brussels Time) will be accepted. Only forms filled out and submitted electronically are accepted.

Note: The information in the E-loket application form can be shared with the Québec team by extracting a PDF file from the application. This means that all information regarding the Québec research team and the budget requested (in CAD) by this team needs to be included in the online application form submitted at FWO.

The following is required:

- Online project application form: General Info, Host Institutions – requested Funding, Project, Peer Review, Ethics, Research Security, Data Management Plan, and Consent.
- **All (co-)supervisors, both from Flanders and Québec, must have an online FWO E-loket profile including academic degrees, positions, and an updated list of publications before the submission deadline.** Please note that:
 - The registration of your E-loket profile (login/password) takes 24 hours. It is therefore strongly advised to start well in advance.
 - For Québec researchers: to simplify the entering of their publication list into E-loket, Québec researchers can group their publications together according to publication type and copy-paste the items as a batch into the system, using the date of entry as

the publication date. It is not necessary to enter each individual publication as a separate entry. Please note that only publications of the past 10 years need to be listed.

- For **each Flemish and Québec team member** the Flemish PI must **upload a short CV** (in English) according to the [template](#) provided in the online application form.

4.2. Administrative form – submitted via the FRQnet Electronic Portfolio for Quebec teams only

To be eligible for this Call, the Québec PI must also complete a separate **administrative form in the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#) by June 18th, 2026 - 4PM Montréal Time.**

All Quebec PIs and CIs and must create and/or update their user profile in the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#). The Québec PI is responsible for creating and completing the form, which includes notably the following sections:

- Project title (in French)
- Abstract (in French)
- Quebec team members (Quebec CIs must consent to their participation via the [FRQnet Electronic Portfolio](#))
- Employment History: The PI and all CIs must complete the form “Eligibility Information” (“*Complément pour l’admissibilité*”) found in the Tool Box of the [FRQ’s program web page](#) and submit this document in the PI and CI sections of the FRQnet form.
- Budget summary
- Other Documents (A and B, if applicable).

A. Retired researchers: A letter must be provided from the university attesting that, for the duration of the grant, the retired researcher will have access to the facilities and logistical support that is necessary to carry out the proposed research activities and will continue to train students and prepare them for a research career in the field in question. The university must also confirm that it will manage and administer the funds in the usual manner.

B. Contracted researcher: For PIs and CIs who hold a non-tenure track position at their university, and who meet the Status 1 definition of the [Common General Rules](#) (Section “Status and Roles”), a letter must be provided from the academic institutions indicating that the researcher(s) in question will maintain this status throughout the duration of the grant. A letter that is not adequately documented could result in the ineligibility of the researcher.

Note that institutional approval will be required prior to submission of the application to FRQ. It is therefore likely that internal deadlines prior to this competition have been established by your institution. **It is your responsibility to inform yourself so that your file can be transmitted to the FRQ before the competition deadline.**

The submission of the administrative form to the FRQ, although mandatory, is purely administrative and does not replace the main application form via the FWO E-loket platform. Any document that is missing or does not comply with the program rules and electronic forms, but is deemed critical for eligibility will render the application ineligible.

5. EVALUATION

5.1. Evaluation procedure

The process will be divided in three steps:

- a. *Administrative eligibility check*, by both agencies, based on the regulations of each agency.
- b. *International Independent Peer Review*: All applications will be peer-reviewed by international experts. Applicants are allowed to list up to three referees to be excluded from the international peer review process. The International Independent Peer Review will serve as input/recommendations for the panel review.
- c. Evaluation by a cross-domain *Joint Selection Committee*. This panel is composed after the call deadline based on the applications that were submitted. This Committee, will compare the applications and establish a ranking separating them in three categories:
 - i. Proposal with the highest score, to be funded with the highest priority to the extent that the budget allows it
 - ii. Proposals with a score above the scientific excellence cut-off point, to be funded if the budget allows it (*reserve list*)
 - iii. Proposals with a score below the scientific excellence cut-off point, not to be funded

The *Joint Selection Committee* is sovereign, its decisions remain final and will be ratified by FWO and FRQ boards.

5.2. Evaluation criteria (for more details see Annex 1)

1. RESEARCHERS (20%)
 - a. Competence of the individual researchers
2. PROJECT (40%)
 - a. Scientific added value, rationale and originality
 - b. Quality of the research approach (methodology), feasibility and focus
 - c. Work plan
3. COLLABORATION (20%)
 - a. Added value of the proposed collaboration
 - b. Balance in terms of work contribution amongst the diverse research groups
4. DEGREE OF INTERDISCIPLINARITY (20%)

Domains falling under at least two of the three sectors of the FRQ ([Health sector](#) // [Society and Culture sector](#) // [Nature and Technologies sector](#)) **must be represented in an integrated and synergistic way at the same coordinated level** through (1) the composition of the bilateral research team, (2) the joint design and development of the project, of issues mobilizing questions or objects of research of the different domains, (3) the innovative methodology adapted to each issue and integrating approaches, and (4) the expected outcomes. **Projects receiving a score of 0 on 'Degree of Interdisciplinarity' will be excluded from funding.**

5.3. Integrity of the evaluation process

The FRQ and FWO Board of Director members are not involved in the scientific evaluation of funding applications, and at no time may applicants and their institutional authorities make contact with the evaluation committee chairperson or members. The agencies have the right to withdraw an application from competition if there is any attempt to lobby the committee or sway the evaluation process.

Every person recruited to sit on an evaluation committee must comply with standard rules of confidentiality regarding the application packages, committee makeup, deliberations and recommendations. The evaluation committee chairperson, members and outside experts are required to disclose any conflicts of interest and must sign a written statement in this regard. For Québec reviewers, refer to the FRQ's [Common General Rules](#).

6. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES

The applicants shall address the intellectual property rights resulting from research conducted under the Bilateral Research Cooperation Program, on a case-by-case basis, by taking into account the intellectual contribution of each participant to the research. For Québec applicants, the management of their intellectual property rights shall be conducted in accordance with FRQ's [Common General Rules](#) and in accordance with the affiliated institutions' internal policy on intellectual property. For Flemish applicants, the management of their intellectual property rights shall be conducted in accordance with [Article 2 of the General Regulations](#).

Based on the FWO regulations, Flemish researchers involved in funded FWO-FRQ projects will be obliged to enter, within nine months after the start of the project agreement, into a partnership agreement with their Québec partners to ensure, amongst other items, the effective protection and correct distribution of the intellectual properties resulting from the projects funded under this call. Please note that no specific format for this agreement will be provided by FWO. The involved host institutions are free to elaborate such a document as long as it contains the necessary basic information.

7. COMMITMENTS

7.1. Financial commitment

The FRQ and FWO strive to fund around four projects in this current call. FWO will only fund the Flemish part of the project. FRQ will only fund the Québec part of the project.

The FRQ receives annual credits from the Québec government to fund its grant programs. It then undertakes annual commitments, conditional on the availability of funds.

7.2. Applicants' commitment

In accepting the grant, applicants agree to comply with all the terms and conditions stipulated in the call and the general regulations of the funding agencies that support them. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware of these terms and conditions.

Besides the clauses specific to their funding organization, in accepting the grant, the team will:

- Submit a mid-term and final research report to FRQ and FWO. FRQ and/or FWO will contact the team leaders to inform them on the form it has to take.
- Mention the funding organization supporting the project (FRQ and FWO) in any report, article or other communications related to the project.

8. TIMELINE

April 27, 2026	Launch of the Call
June 18, 2026 - 5:00 PM Brussels Time	Deadline for MAIN APPLICATION submitted to FWO E-loket by Flemish PI.
June 18, 2026 - 4:00 PM Montreal Time	Deadline for ADMINISTRATIVE FORM submitted to FRQnet by the Québec team.
June 2026	Eligibility check
June – September 2026	International Independent Peer Review
December 2026	Joint Selection Committee and results announcement
January 1, 2027	Start of the projects

Annex 1: Québec-Flanders Bilateral Research Cooperation Program – Evaluation Criteria and Score Grid

Annex 1:

Québec-Flanders Bilateral Research Cooperation Program - Evaluation Criteria and Score Grid

1. Competence of the individual researchers							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>This criterion assesses to what extent the individual researchers, included in the bilateral research project, have the necessary competences (i.e. knowledge and skills) and infrastructure to implement the proposed project. Assess to what extent the individual researchers, <u>taking into account their scientific seniority</u>, have made important scientific contributions to the state-of-the art in their respective domain, as evidenced by a range of scientifically relevant activities and achievements, such as the quality and impact (rather than the quantity) of the publication record, as well as other meaningful scientific output and achievements. The latter may include education activities, supervision of pre- and postdoctoral researchers, institutional responsibilities (governance, administration, ...), membership of scientific organisations, societies, networks, R&D services provided to third parties, sabbaticals, relevant training, scientific awards and other relevant information. Consider a variety of scientific or other (societal, economic, ...) impact beyond publications and obtained research funding. International recognition of the included individual researchers in their scientific domain is necessary to receive outstanding scores for this criterion.</p>							
<p>Some of the included individual researchers lack the inherent competences required to perform the proposed research. Teamwork will not compensate for this weak link. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers which is, considering their scientific seniority and a variety of activities/achievements, unacceptable and as such insufficient to adequately contribute to the proposed research.</p>	<p>Some of the included individual researchers do not fully possess the necessary competences, expertise, skills and/or experience to carry out their part of the research in a proper way. Only through close collaboration among all included researchers, will they manage to carry out the actual research. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of some of the included individual researchers which, taking into account their scientific seniority and a variety of activities/achievements, is poor and as such possibly insufficient to adequately contribute to the proposed research.</p>	<p>The competence, expertise, skills and/or experience of some of the individual researchers in the consortium leads to concerns on a successful execution of the proposed research. However, as a whole, the research consortium possesses the necessary competences to carry out the proposed research. This is reflected in the track record and main research achievements of the included individual researchers which, taking into account their scientific seniority and a variety of activities/achievements, is sufficient to carry out the proposed research.</p>	<p>All the included individual researchers are competent and independent researchers with (very) good skills and knowledge to execute the proposed research. Taking into account the scientific seniority and a variety of activities/achievements, the track record and main research achievements of all included individual researchers is (very) good. Together they will bring the proposed research to a good end. Some of the included individual researchers are less internationally recognized for the contributions made within their scientific domain, but this is being compensated by the more international contributions of other included individual researchers.</p>	<p>All the included individual researchers are competent and independent researchers with excellent skills and extended knowledge to execute the proposed project. Taking into account the scientific seniority and a variety of activities/achievements, the track record and main research achievements of all key members of the consortium is impressive. The excellent competence and available expertise, skills and/or experience gives confidence in a successful execution of the proposed research. Key partners of the consortium are internationally recognised amongst the best of their scientific domain (or 'rising stars' in their domain, taking into account the scientific seniority).</p>			

2. Scientific quality of the bilateral research project.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>2.a. Scientific added value, rationale and originality. The targeted research goals of a bilateral research proposal must contribute to the current international state-of-the-art. To what extent is the proposal original and will it generate knowledge that goes beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g. novel concepts or novel approaches)? Does the bilateral research project contain a strong rationale and robust/original hypothesis, does it propose innovative methodological approaches and is it sufficiently detailed?</p>							
<p>The targeted research results are not original at all, do not build upon the international state-of-art and will not offer an added value to the state-of-the-art in its domain. AND/OR Have even been studied before (duplicate of previous studies). AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are lacking.</p>	<p>The targeted research results are not very original and their innovative character is limited. 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-art. AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are rather weak.</p>	<p>The project is moderately original and/or the targeted research results are primarily incremental in terms of contribution to the current state-of-the-art. The rationale and hypothesis are present, however, not strongly motivated.</p>	<p>The targeted research goals are timely, innovative and original. The research results will contribute clearly to the current international state-of-the-art in the scientific domain. The rationale is strong and hypothesis clear.</p>	<p>The project is timely, unique and extremely original. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research efforts at the international level. It is a pioneering project based on ground-breaking and challenging ideas, concepts and research strategies.</p>			
<p>2.b. Quality of the research approach (methodology), feasibility and focus. A bilateral research proposal must be scientifically challenging and nonetheless feasible. To what extent is the outlined scientific approach challenging, feasible and focussed, bearing in mind the project the requested budget and a project duration of maximum three years?</p>							
<p>The research methodology is not appropriate/not suited to reach the scientific goals, is overall vaguely described/lacking or irrevocably outdated compared to the state-of-the-art. AND/OR The project is not feasible and/or not focussed at all, because e.g. it involves too many planned activities (too broad). AND/OR The project is not ambitious at all and does not require the requested budget or could be finished in much less than the foreseen time.</p>	<p>The research approach shows serious weaknesses and/or shortcomings. AND/OR The research approach lacks key elements and should be improved substantially to meet the state-of-art. AND/OR The feasibility and/or focus of the scientific project objectives are doubtful. AND/OR Overall the project is not ambitious enough given the requested budget and/or foreseen timeframe.</p>	<p>The research approach is appropriate, but lacks some elements and/or contains some shortcomings. The methodology is state-of-the-art. AND/OR The project is feasible, but could've been more focussed. It is, however, likely that the scientific goals will be delivered partly. AND/OR Despite some ambitious aspects, the project could have been somewhat more challenging given the requested budget and/or foreseen timeframe.</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is (very) well elaborated, relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. There are no significant gaps and/or shortcomings and methodologically sufficiently innovative. AND The balance between scientific challenges and feasibility of the scientific project objectives is (very) good. The work plan proposes an efficient use of the budget and the foreseen time frame. Risk mitigation strategy is present and appropriate measures were taken to make the research transparent and reproducible.</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is the most relevant, efficient and effective to reach the scientific goals and is considered as international state-of-the-art methodology in its domain. The methodology is highly innovative, well elaborated and perfectly clear. AND Excellent focus, optimal balance between high-level scientific challenges and intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project objectives. The work plan fits perfectly the foreseen time frame and requested budget. In addition, the proposal clearly identifies potential risks and proposes carefully designed alternative research strategies and 'fall back' options. Appropriate measures were taken to make the research transparent and reproducible.</p>			
<p>2.c. Work plan. A bilateral research project must have a clearly defined work plan outlining the different work packages with their goals, research activities, timing and deliverables. A clear description of the roles of each included researcher is crucial to understand how a bilateral research project will be executed and managed. The presence of well-defined coordination tasks and a good communication strategy in the work plan can lead to outstanding scores in this criterion.</p>							
<p>The project proposal does not include any sufficiently elaborated work plan that allows the assessment of this criterion. It is not clear at all by whom, when and how each proposed research activity will be performed.</p>	<p>The work plan and task allocation is not sufficiently developed. Important information is missing and significant structural adjustments are necessary.</p>	<p>The work plan is satisfactory and touches upon the different roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages. However, in particular aspects the work plan and/or task allocation amongst the consortium partners remains vague or confusing and could be significantly improved.</p>	<p>The work plan, including the different work packages, is (very) clear and concretely defined, including the roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages.</p>	<p>The work plan is sound and meticulously defined including the different roles and responsibilities of each research group to the different work packages. The goals and research activities of each work package are described in detail. In addition, the work plan includes well-defined project management tasks and a good communication strategy which contributes optimal to the smooth execution of each work package.</p>			

3. Quality of the proposed collaboration of the bilateral research project.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable	Good/Very Good		Excellent/Outstanding		

3.a. Added value of the proposed collaboration

This criterion assesses whether the collaboration has an added value for the bilateral research proposal. To what extent is the collaboration, containing the right combination of partners and expertises, unique and crucial to execute the proposed research. Is the rationale for bringing together these researchers/research groups clear and strong or is this partnership rather randomly composed and artificial? The complementarity/synergy of the included researchers and equipment must be clearly motivated in the research proposal.

<p>The collaboration is artificial: There is no added value in the proposed bilateral collaboration. The proposed research can be performed alone or with local partners equally well. AND/OR The synergy in expertises and the rationale for collaboration is completely lacking. AND/OR The bilateral research team is not adequately composed and as a result will not reach the targeted research objectives.</p>	<p>The added value of the proposed bilateral collaboration is limited and its rationale is (rather) lacking. It is not clear how the included expertises are relevant and needed for the project. AND/OR Not every necessary expertise is either present or some expertise is doubled. It is unlikely that the consortium as a whole will be able to remedy the lack of expertise.</p>	<p>The added value of the collaboration is acceptable, but not fully convincing. The complementarity is present ,however, not strong. The synergy between the research groups end expertises could've been stronger and/or needs a better argumentation. AND/OR The composition is not optimal as expertise is lacking, however, deficiencies may be compensated by the other consortium members. The role of each researcher in the execution of the project is not clear.</p>	<p>The added value of the bilateral collaboration is clearly present and contributes (very) well to the execution of the project. There is a (very) good rationale for setting up this collaboration. The synergy between the research groups/expertises is (very) strong. AND/OR All the necessary expertise and equipment to execute the proposed research is present. The composition of and task allocation amongst the bilateral research team is clearly described and (very) well motivated.</p>	<p>The synergy between the consortium partners is pronounced and the complementarity is key for the successful execution of the proposed research activities. The reasons for including these specific research groups/expertises are perfectly clear and valid. The proposed collaboration is crucial to achieve the proposed research goals. The bilateral research team is a perfectly balanced team of excellent internationally recognized researchers (taking into account the scientific seniority), in which each one of them has a vital role to play in the execution of the proposed research activities. All the required expertise and equipment is present in the most optimal way.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

3.b. Balance in terms of work contribution amongst the diverse research groups

Each bilateral research consortium must be balanced in terms of work contribution between the Flemish and foreign research groups. To what extent does every included research group optimally contribute to the proposed research activities? How do the contributions relate to the requested budget?

<p>There is no balance in work distribution amongst the included research groups. There is imbalance between the requested budget and workload for some of the groups.</p>	<p>No possibility for scoring</p>	<p>There is a reasonable balance in terms of work distribution amongst the included research groups, taking into account the requested budget and the expertise within the different groups.</p>	<p>No possibility for scoring</p>	<p>Each research group contributes in the most optimal way to the proposed research activities. There are no imbalances in terms of work contribution, taking into account the requested budget of each included research group.</p>
--	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--

4. Degree of interdisciplinarity							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>Domains falling under at least two of the three branches of the FRQ (Health sector // Society and Culture sector // Nature and Technologies sector) must be represented in an integrated and synergistic way at the same coordinated level through (1) the composition of the bilateral research team, (2) the joint design and development of the project, of issues mobilizing questions or objects of research of the different domains, (3) the innovative methodology adapted to each issue and integrating approaches, and (4) the expected outcomes.</p>							
<p>The project is not interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary at all. The proposed research is focused within one sector of the FRQ and all team members fall under the same FRQ sector.</p>	<p>The project is multidisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers domains falling under at least two of the three sectors of the FRQ, the expertise, methods, tools, data, etc. of one domain are merely used as an 'instrument' for the other domain. The various domains do not benefit or mutually influence each other. Instead, they are juxtaposed. Not all of the domains involved will be impacted by the outcomes of the project.</p>	<p>The proposed research includes domains falling under two of the three sectors of the FRQ. Although mutual interactive input is necessary from specialists from domains covered by two out of three FRQ sectors to address the proposed research question(s), the level of integration is not that extensive/profound. AND/OR Not all of the domains involved will influence each other to the same extent and therefore will not have equal benefits from the project.</p>	<p>The proposed research includes domains falling under two of the three sectors of the FRQ. Mutual interactive input is necessary from specialists from domains covered by two out of three FRQ sectors to (1) address the proposed research question(s) in an integrated way and (2) to advance fundamental understanding beyond a single domain. AND All of the domains involved will benefit from and mutually influence each other in the most optimal way. As a result, the outcomes will have an impact on all of the domains involved and will have substantial added value for each of the domains. New bridges between previously unrelated fields will be triggered.</p>	<p>The proposed research includes domains falling under all three sectors of the FRQ. Mutual interactive input is necessary from specialists from domains covered by all three FRQ sectors to (1) address the proposed research question(s) in an integrated way and (2) to advance fundamental understanding beyond a single domain. AND All of the domains involved will benefit from and mutually influence each other in the most optimal way. As a result, the outcomes will have an impact on all of the domains involved and will have substantial added value for each of the domains. New bridges between previously unrelated fields will be triggered.</p>			

Projects receiving a score of 0 on 'Degree of Interdisciplinarity' will be excluded from funding.