

## Seed funding score grid

	1	2	3	4
<b>Quality of partnership</b>	There is doubt about the new partnership or the existing partnership has not created enough output, or there is a problem with the appointment of the researchers involved.	It concerns a new partnership, or an existing partnership in a similar field of research, with insufficiently clear potential.	It involves a new partnership, or an existing partnership in a new but similar field of research, with potential.	It involves a strong and promising new partnership or an existing successful partnership in a new field of research.
<b>Experience/expertise of involved researchers</b>	The researchers involved have (almost) no research experience and/or do not possess relevant or complementary expertise to carry out the project as expected.	The researchers involved have limited research experience and/or lack sufficient relevant or complementary expertise to carry out the project as expected.	The researchers involved have research experience and/or possess relevant expertise to carry out the project as expected. The complementarity of the researchers involved is less clear or convincing.	The researchers involved have the necessary research experience and have relevant and complementary expertise to carry out the project and achieve the stated objectives.
<b>Use of funds</b>	It is unclear how the use of funds will contribute to the achievement of the stated objectives and/or function as a means of realising a sustainable partnership between the research groups.	There is doubt as to whether the use of funds is the most appropriate for achieving the set objectives and realising a sustainable partnership between the research groups.	Funds are used in a relevant way in order to achieve the set objectives and provide the opportunity for realising a sustainable partnership between the research groups.	Funds are used in an optimal way in order to achieve the set objectives and maximise the opportunity for realising a sustainable partnership between the research groups.
<b>Quality of project proposal</b>	The wording of the project proposal is too vague and/or the added value compared to the state of the art is insufficiently clear and/or the added value for economic and/or societal	It concerns a good-quality project proposal with concrete objectives and contribution to the state of the art, but the added value for economic and/or societal stakeholders is not	It concerns a good-quality project proposal with concrete objectives, contribution to the state of the art and added value for economic and/or societal stakeholders. An	It concerns a good-quality project proposal with concrete objectives, contribution to the state of the art and clear added value for economic and/or societal stakeholders. The

	stakeholders has not been demonstrated.	sufficiently clear or has not been demonstrated.	interdisciplinary approach could have added value.	interdisciplinary approach is an added value.
<b>Chances of success with external funding source</b>	There are one or more intended external funding channels, but they are not sufficiently clearly described or deemed unfeasible.	Several potential funding channels are identified without a concrete plan of action, leaving doubts about the feasibility or likelihood of success.	One or more intended external funding channels are identified and specified. The chances of success with this funding channel are realistic.	One or more intended external funding channels are identified and specified. The chances of success with this funding channel are excellent.