

Towards a paradigm shift in mental health care :

FIRST CALL FOR MENTAL HEALTH RESEARCH PROPOSALS

2025-2026

The Fund for Mental Health Research was created to support Mental Health Research in Belgium. The Fund is managed by the King Baudouin Foundation with the help of a dedicated Steering Committee

The Fund is launching its first call for research projects in mental health, supported by the European Science Foundation (ESF), to shift the current paradigm and prioritize underfunded yet critical research areas in mental healthcare—addressing urgent, unmet needs.

Subject of the Call

This call invites innovative research proposals targeting the **10 research priorities** set out in the document [Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities](#). The research priorities were developed through a participatory process involving patients, families, caregivers, researchers, and policymakers to bridge gaps in mental health research and ensure alignment with real-world needs.

Scope: Proposals must focus on one or more of the 10 research priorities, which span prevention, detection, treatment, health literacy and recovery, and healthcare provision and organization. The call emphasizes **inclusivity, interdisciplinary collaboration, and practical impact**, particularly for underrepresented groups and conditions.

Rationale: Mental health research remains underfunded and often disconnected from the needs of patients and caregivers. This call aim is to foster **research that is participatory, evidence-based, and actionable**, ensuring that findings translate into tangible improvements in mental healthcare.

Type of Research: We welcome **applied, and practice-oriented research, including interventions, policy evaluations, and implementation studies**. Fundamental research will only be considered if it demonstrates a clear pathway to practical application or addresses a critical gap in one of the 10 research priorities. Collaborative and co-created projects are very strongly encouraged.

All information regarding this Call will be available in English only.

Eligibility

Mental Health Research Priorities

In supporting research, the Fund for Mental Health Research strives for maximum impact. It is essential that research outcomes not only advance scientific knowledge but also translate into practice and improving the quality of life of people living with mental health issues and their family members. This means that the criteria of scientific excellence and addressing unmet needs are given equal importance and must go hand in hand.

Therefore, to be eligible, the research project must address at least one of the following 10 research priorities: (see [Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities](#) for details on each of the research priorities)

- How do we organise and implement mental health prevention programmes that are widely accessible and efficient for everyone, with a focus on socially vulnerable people?
- How can families, schools and other informal support actors work better with the professional care sector with a view to early recognition of mental health problems, raising awareness and referral?
- How can we detect and treat mental health problems in older people more quickly and effectively?
- In a society that is diverse in many ways, how can we better tailor care to people's individual needs, even when complex issues are involved?
- How do we establish a culture of evidence-based practice as the norm in mental healthcare?
- How can we embed recovery principles, such as self-management and participation, in mental healthcare, in order to give people long-term support in their recovery and reintegration? What role can the social environment play?

- How can we better define the profiles of loved ones of people with mental health issues in order to offer them more personalised support?
- How can we involve loved ones more in the care process, using better implementation strategies?
- How can we promote access to and continuity of care? How can we improve cooperation between actors within and outside mental healthcare?
- What causes long waiting times, what is the impact of waiting, and how can we reduce it?

Research team

The Call invites research teams with proven expertise in addressing the relevant scientific issue and demonstrable experience in collaborating with public health stakeholders, policymakers, mental health professionals, patients, and their representatives throughout the research design and research implementation process.

Composition of the research team:

Main applicants (max 2 from the same research institution)

- with demonstrated scientific excellence
- with experience in leading an interdisciplinary research project
- at least 1 main applicant should have experience in collaborating with stakeholders in the design and implementation of the research
- have scientific seniority of min. PhD + 7 years of research activities on the deadline for submission of application (with additional time for documented career break)
- are able to devote at least 10% of their research time to this project.
- have a permanent or long-term contract at their administering institution until at least 6 months past the foreseen end date of the project.
- may not apply to this Call more than once as main applicant but may apply as a co-applicant on more than one application

Co-applicants (max 5)

- add complementary and relevant expertise to the research project
- are essential for the successful completion of the proposed research and make a significant contribution
- have experience working on an interdisciplinary research project
- can be at any career stage and from any discipline relevant to the proposed research.

- must have a guarantee for a space from their host institution for the duration of their commitment to the project, but do not need to have a permanent or long-term contract at their administering institution
- be able to contribute at least 20% of their research time to this project
- salary costs can only be covered for co-applicants working at a Belgian institution

Collaborators (no limit)

- relevance of their expertise to the research project.
- cannot receive funding beyond the necessary costs associated with their participation.

Location

- The project is initiated and coordinated by researchers conducting their research activity at a university (including universities of applied sciences) or not-for-profit research centre legally based in Belgium.

Collaborations

- The complementarity of the scientific expertise of the main research team and collaborators has to be demonstrated
- The research team is expected to have established a consortium of stakeholders (collaborators) and to have consulted the consortium during the preparation of the project proposal to make sure the needs are fully understood.
- For-profit organizations may be part of a research team but are excluded from receiving funding.

Mandatory information session

- **At least 1 representative of the research team will be required to attend the in-person information session on 12/11/2025.**
- This session will cover the specifics of the Call and provide an overview of the Mental Health Care Research priorities that underpin this initiative.
- Registration for the information session is required: [Registration form](#)

Application procedure

The submission of proposals is structured through a two-phase procedure.

All documents must be submitted, in English, electronically through the ESF online platform, in one single PDF file (formatted in a standard font (e.g., Arial, Times New Roman, Calibri) with a minimum font size of 12pt).

Applicants will first submit a three-page Letter of Intent outlining their research idea, the Mental Health Care Research (MHCR) priority/priorities they want to address and the composition of the research team and consortium.

Applicants whose Letters of Intent are successful will be invited to submit a full proposal of up to 10 pages providing detailed information on the project and its methodology.

The full proposal must include all the information requested in the online system, covering but not limited to the following aspects:

- General project information: Host institution, acronym, title, scientific abstract and lay summary
- Scientific excellence: state of the art, clearly stating the Mental Health Care Research (MHCR) priority/priorities being addressed, preliminary data (if any); project aims and objectives; expected results; methodology and scientific approach; work plan; Gantt chart; detailed budget; study limitations and contingency plan; scientific and social relevance; ethical, social, legal and environmental project implications; dissemination, social engagement and knowledge transfer, description of the research environment in all its dimensions.

A list of maximum 20 references to previous work can be added related to the scientific excellence and impact of the research project.

- Research team:
 - Research team: description of the contribution of each member of the research team
 - Main applicants: relevance and research experience in relation to the research project. Experience collaborating with stakeholders during research design and implementation and fostering an inclusive, and supportive research environment.
 - Co-applicants: brief description of the relevance, experience and contributions of the co-applicants
 - Collaborators: brief description of the role and relevance of the collaborators involved in the research project
 - Publications: a minimum of 1 and maximum of 5 publications by the main applicant(s) and each co-applicant should be added, appropriately related to the information in the Research Team section.

Evaluation

Upon eligibility check by the King Baudouin Foundation, applications will be assessed by two international Review Panels independently set-up by ESF: a scientific panel and an impact panel, with equal weight on the selection. The evaluation process will include two steps: 1) Sifting phase based on the Letters of Intent and 2) Consensus phase based on Full Proposals.

The Review Panels will assess the projects based on the evaluation criteria for each evaluation step and will draw up recommendations for the Fund Steering Committee managed by the King Baudouin Foundation, who will make the final decision.

The decision will be published in July 2026

Evaluation criteria

Letter of intent:

1. **Scientific quality of the project:** (reviewed by the Scientific Review Panel: see parts 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of annex I)
 - Scope and objectives of the Call:
The project must address at least 1 MHCR priority, as defined in "[Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities](#)"
The project should present high-quality, innovative research ideas that can lead to significant advances in understanding or translation of scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority.
 - Quality of the project team/consortium:
The project team must possess the necessary skills and expertise to ensure the success of the project.
2. **Potential impact of the project:** (reviewed by the Impact Review Panel: see 2.1 and 2.2 of annex I)
 - Scope of the Call:
The project address at least one MHCR priority, as defined in "[Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities](#)"
 - Impact of the research team/consortium:
The impact of the project is dependent on all relevant experts and stakeholders having been identified and consulted before the project starts and remaining implicated during the entire project process.

Letters of Intent are scored A, B or C:

Score A: The project meets the evaluation criteria and is of a very high standard.

Score B: The proposal meets the evaluation criteria to a certain extent but has 1 or more important shortcomings.

Score C: The proposal does not meet the criteria adequately.

Only Letters of Intent with global scores AA, AB or BA are considered.

Full Proposal:

Full Proposals will be scored on a 5-point scale according to five evaluation criteria, specific to each of the two Review Panels:

1. Scientific quality of the project (reviewed by the Scientific Review Panel):

- Scope of the Call: The project must address at least 1 MHCR priority, as defined in [“Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities”](#)
- Objectives of the Call: The project should present high-quality, innovative research ideas that can lead to significant advances in understanding or translation of scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority.
- Quality of the project team/consortium: The project team must possess the necessary skills and expertise to ensure the success of the project.
- Quality of the project strategy: The project plan/strategy must be well elaborated and balanced and include the appropriate mitigation plan and a clear governance structure
- Budget: The proposed budget must be appropriate for the project and aligned with the scope and needs of the project.

2. Potential impact of the project (reviewed by the Impact Review Panel):

- Scope of the Call: The project must address at least one MHCR priority, as defined in [“Bridging Gaps in Mental Health: 10 Research Priorities”](#)
- Impact of the research team/consortium: The impact of the project is dependent on all relevant experts and stakeholders having been identified and consulted before the project starts and remaining implicated during the entire project process.
- Impact potential of the project: The project holds significant impact potential if the proposed outcomes offer substantial added value, include a plan for asset-building, and have a clear strategy for ensuring that the research and its outcomes are understood by relevant stakeholders.
- Implementation and dissemination: The project demonstrates strong implementation, and dissemination plans if outreach activities are well-defined in advance, and concrete complementary funding strategies are explored

- **Responsible Research:** The project must address ethical, diversity and socio-cultural considerations, and ensure that it receives the necessary support from its host institution.

The full evaluation and scoring rubric for Full Proposals is available in see Annex I. Following the assessment by each of the two Review Panels, final ranking will be elaborated based on the discussion and consensus by the two Review Panels.

Following each selection stage, applicants will be informed of the selection results by the King Baudouin Foundation.

Timeline:



Grant

Amount, duration and allocation

- Three to 4 research projects can receive a grant of € 400.000 to € 600.000. Each spanning a minimum period of 4 years.
- The support can be used for all costs related to the project. Any outsourcing for supporting international or intranational expenses is subject to the approval by the Fund Steering Committee.
- The grant will be awarded to the Host Institution (of the main applicants), which will be responsible for distributing the budget between the different partners in the research team.
- The grant will be made available in instalments conditional upon approval of the activity reporting.

- The grantees will be invited to an annual meeting with the Fund Steering Committee to present and discuss the projects progress.

Overhead

- The overhead cannot exceed 17% and must be included in the budget.

Contact

For information regarding the Call:

Laetitia Aerts – Tel +32-(0)2-549 02 33 – aerts.l@kbs-frb.be

Want to stay informed on other Calls related to (bio)medical research?
Subscribe to the [e-news](#) medical research!

King Baudouin Foundation

Working together for a better society

The King Baudouin Foundation's mission is to contribute to a better society.

The Foundation is an actor for change and innovation, serving the public interest and increasing social cohesion in Belgium and Europe. We seek to maximize our impact by strengthening the capacity of organizations and individuals. We also stimulate effective philanthropy by individuals and corporations.

The King Baudouin Foundation is a public benefit foundation. The Foundation was set up in 1976 on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of King Baudouin's reign.

With thanks to the Belgian National Lottery and to all donors for their valued support.

kbs-frb.be Subscribe to our [e-news](#)

Follow us on [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

Annex I: Scoring rubric Scientific panel and Impact panel

1. Scientific quality	Poor (1)	Sufficient (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Outstanding (5)
1.1 Scope of the Call	A project is in scope with the Call if it addresses at least one MHCR priority				
The project fits the scope of the Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project does not fit the scope of the Call and should not be considered - The aims of the project are unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is not fully aligned with the scope of the Call, there are important mismatches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the project is in scope, there are minor concerns regarding the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is in scope with the Call; it addresses at least one of the MHCR priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is fully in scope with the Call, it addresses at least one of the MHCR priorities with high relevance to the Belgian context
1.2 Objectives of the Call	The project fits with the objectives of the Call when it presents high-quality, innovative research ideas that can lead to significant advances in understanding or translation of scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority.				
The aim of the research project is to generate significant advances in understanding and/or to translate scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research project doesn't aim for significant advances in understanding and/or the translation of Scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address the unmet need(s) - There is evidence that the project would not be able to achieve these aims. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are major concerns regarding the aims of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are minor concerns regarding the aims of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project aims to generate significant advances in understanding and/or to translate Scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project unquestionably aims to generate significant advances in understanding and/or to translate Scientific knowledge into viable methodologies, tools or techniques to address at least one MHCR priority
The approach is innovative. It develops and tests new concepts, methods or technologies, or combines existing ones in new ways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach is not innovative or not appropriate to address the question at hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are major concerns regarding the innovativeness of the approach - There are major concerns about the appropriateness of the approach to address the question at hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are minor concerns regarding the innovativeness and/or appropriateness of the approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach is innovative and appropriate to address the question at hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approach is unquestionably innovative, creative and appropriate
The research project is of high quality. It is supported by evidence, and the proposed outcomes/outputs are realistic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project is of low quality, or there is no evidence to support that the proposed outcomes/ outputs are realistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project is of poor quality, - There is no supporting evidence, or the supporting evidence is not convincing. - The outcomes/ outputs are not realistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research project is of good quality. - There are minor weaknesses in the supporting evidence and/or feasibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project is of high-quality, there is good supporting evidence and the proposed outcomes are realistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research project is of outstanding quality, with excellent supporting evidence and realistic outcomes
1.3 quality of the main research team/ consortium	The project team possess the necessary skills and expertise to ensure the success of the project.				
The main applicant(s) has(ve) the necessary competences to ensure the success of the project (including scientific expertise, management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main applicant(s) are lacking crucial competences to bring this project to success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are major concerns whether the main applicant(s) have the necessary competences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main applicant(s) lack one or more essential competences, but they have included mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main applicants have good demonstratable competences to bring the project to success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main applicants have excellent competences to bring the project to success

skills, links with the MH community in Belgium.)			strategies (trainings, co-applicants/collaborators with the necessary skills...) - There are minor concerns regarding the competence of the main applicant(s)		
All necessary scientific disciplines are represented in the team to build a successful research project, and the included disciplines are complementary All necessary expertise on the MCHR priority is present within the team to bring the research project to success (collaborators) The research environment is adequate to make the research project a success	The collaboration lacks essential disciplines, and/or there is too much overlap between the disciplines in the collaboration Not enough/not the right collaborators are included to correctly assess the MCHR priority in question The research environment is seriously lacking	There are major concerns regarding the complementarity and interdisciplinarity of the collaboration One or more essential expertise(s) is missing from the collaboration There are major concerns regarding the research environment	There are minor concerns regarding the complementarity and interdisciplinarity of the collaboration Some additional expertise would benefit the collaboration There are minor concerns regarding the research environment	The team consists of a strong complementary and interdisciplinary collaboration The right expertise is present within the collaboration The research environment is good	The team consists of an unquestionably strong complementary and interdisciplinary collaboration Outstanding expertise is present within the collaboration The research environment is excellent
1.4 Quality of the project strategy	The project plan/strategy is well elaborated and balanced including an appropriate mitigation plan and a clear governance structure				
The research strategy is clearly defined, with a smart working plan including clear work packages and tasks corresponding to the project objectives	The research strategy is not clearly defined, insufficiently elaborated or seriously unbalanced.	There are major concerns regarding the project strategy	There are minor concerns regarding the project strategy	The project strategy is good	The project strategy is excellent
a) Major milestones and deliverables have been identified	The major milestones and deliverables are not clearly mentioned	There are major concerns regarding milestones and deliverables	There are minor concerns regarding milestones and deliverables	The project contains all major milestones and deliverables	The project contains outstanding milestones and deliverables
b) A mitigation plan is foreseen for risks and pitfalls	A risk mitigation plan is not clearly mentioned	There are major concerns regarding the risk mitigation plan	There are minor concerns regarding the risk mitigation plan	There is a good risk mitigation plan	There is an outstanding risk mitigation plan
c) There is a clear governance structure foreseen	A governance structure is not clearly described	There are major concerns regarding the project governance structure	There are minor concerns regarding the project governance structure	There is a good governance structure in place	There is an outstanding governance structure in place
Different tasks/ responsibilities are balanced between the different team members, and all team members will be able to substantially contribute to the project	The allocation of responsibilities/tasks within the project is not clearly mentioned	There are major concerns regarding the allocation of responsibilities/tasks	There are minor concerns regarding the allocation of responsibilities/tasks	There is a good balance of responsibilities and tasks	There is an outstanding balance of responsibilities and tasks
The described deliverables contribute to answering the MH research priority that is being addressed	It is unclear how the deliverables can contribute to the aim of the project	There are major concerns on how the deliverables can contribute to the aim of the project	There are minor concerns on how the deliverables can contribute to the aim of the project	The contribution of the deliverables to the aim of the project is well described	The contribution of the deliverables to the aim of the project is excellently described.
1.5 Budget	The proposed budget is appropriate and aligned with the scope and needs of the project				

The project budget is adequate to obtain the expected deliverables	The budget is not adequate	There are major concerns regarding the adequateness of the budget	There are minor concerns regarding the adequateness of the budget	The project budget is adequate	The project budget is perfectly adequate
The investment is justified, considering the expected usefulness of the project to help address the MH research priority	The investment is not justified	There are major questions regarding cost/benefit	There are minor questions regarding cost/benefit	The project investment is justified	The project investment is unquestionably justified
The distribution of the budget over the project (work packages, deliverables, proof-of-principle) is balanced	The distribution of the budget is not justifiable	There are major questions regarding balance of the budget	There are minor questions regarding balance of the budget	The distribution is justifiable	The distribution is unquestionable justifiable

2. Impact	Insignificant (1)	Low (2)	Average (3)	Significant (4)	Highly significant (5)
2.1 Scope of the Call	The project is in scope with the Call if it aims to address at least one MHCR priority				
The project fits the scope of the Call	- The project does not fit the scope of the Call and should not be considered - The aims of the project are unclear	- The project is not fully aligned with the scope of the Call, there are important mismatches	Although the project is in scope, there are minor questions/issues regarding the topic	The project is in scope with the Call; it addresses at least one of the MHCR priorities	The project is fully in scope with the Call; it addresses at least one of the MHCR priorities with high relevance to the Belgian context
2.2 Impact of the project team	The research team/consortium can have impact if all relevant experts and stakeholders are identified, consulted before the project starts, and remain implicated during the entire project process				
The proposed research team has the capacity to ensure significant impact on the MHCR priority	The research team is lacking in essential relevant experts	There are major concerns regarding the composition of the research team	There are minor concerns regarding the composition of the research team	The research team is composed of the necessary and complementary experts	The research team is composed of outstanding and complementary experts
The relevant stakeholders have been identified	Very relevant stakeholders are missing from the research team	There are major concerns regarding the identified stakeholders	There are minor concerns regarding the identified stakeholders	The relevant stakeholders have been identified	An outstanding group of relevant stakeholders has been identified
Stakeholders were sufficiently consulted in preparation of the project to assure full understanding of the unmet needs	Stakeholders were not consulted in preparation of the project, or it cannot be understood from the proposal if they were consulted	There are major concerns regarding the consultation of stakeholders in preparation of the project	There are minor concerns regarding the consultation of stakeholders in preparation of the project	Stakeholders were sufficiently consulted in preparation of the project to assure full understanding of the needs	Stakeholders were thoroughly consulted in preparation of the project to assure full understanding of the needs
The strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project is sufficiently clear	The strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project is missing or unclear	There are major concerns regarding the strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project	There are minor concerns regarding the strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project	A good strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project is elaborated	An outstanding strategy regarding stakeholder engagement during the project is elaborated
2.3 Impact potential of the project	The project holds significant impact potential if the proposed outcomes offer substantial added value, include a plan for asset-building, and have a clear strategy for ensuring that the research and its outcomes are understood by relevant stakeholders.				
The proposed outcomes have significant impact potential, they offer substantial added value	The proposed outcomes lack in impact potential, the potential added value is lacking	There are major concerns regarding the impact potential of the proposed outcomes	There are minor concerns regarding the impact potential of the proposed outcomes	The proposed outcomes have significant impact potential; they can offer substantial added value-added value	The proposed outcomes have outstanding impact potential, they can offer outstanding added value

The project mentions asset-building efforts (methodologies, tools, techniques, data...) in line with the FAIR principles	The asset-building effort are lacking	There are major concerns regarding asset-building	There are minor concerns regarding asset-building	The project mentions asset-building efforts (methodologies, tools, techniques, data...) in line with the FAIR principles	The project mentions outstanding asset-building efforts (methodologies, tools, techniques, data...) in line with the FAIR principles
There is a communications and management plan with collaborating public health stakeholders and policymakers to make sure the research is seen and understood by relevant stakeholders	A plan for collaboration with public health stakeholders and policymakers is lacking	There are major concerns regarding the plan for collaboration with public health stakeholders and policymakers is lacking	There are minor concerns regarding the plan for collaboration with public health stakeholders and policymakers is lacking	There is a good communications and management plan with collaborating public health stakeholders and policymakers to make sure the research is seen and understood by relevant stakeholders	There is an outstanding communications and management plan with collaborating public health stakeholders and policymakers to make sure the research is seen and understood by relevant stakeholders
2.4 Implementation and dissemination	The project has good implementation, and dissemination plans if outreach activities are well-defined in advance, and concrete complementary funding strategies are explored				
Outreach activities are foreseen within the project proposal	Outreach activities are lacking	There are major concerns regarding the planned outreach activities	There are minor concerns regarding the planned outreach activities	Outreach activities are foreseen within the project proposal	Outstanding outreach activities are foreseen within the project proposal
The project consortium envisages concrete complementary funding for the (long-term) project objectives	Explorations for concrete complementary funding is lacking in the long run	There are major concerns regarding the exploration of concrete complementary funding	There are minor concerns regarding the exploration of concrete complementary funding	Concrete complementary funding for the (long-term) project objectives are being explored	Outstanding concrete complementary funding for the (long-term) project objectives are being explored
2.5 Responsible research	The project should take into account any ethical, diversity and socio-cultural issues that might be relevant and receive the necessary support from its host institution				
Ethical issues have been sufficiently taken into account Equity, diversity and inclusion issues have been sufficiently taken into account	Ethical issues are not taken into account Gender/diversity issues are not taken into account	There are major concerns regarding ethics There are major concerns regarding relevant gender/diversity issues	There are minor concerns regarding ethics There are minor concerns regarding relevant gender/diversity issues	Ethical issues are sufficiently taken into account Gender/diversity issues are sufficiently taken into account	Ethical issues are being handled extremely well Gender/diversity issues are being handled extremely well
Host institution can demonstrate career development opportunities for the research team	Career development opportunities at the host institution are unclear	There are major concerns regarding the career development opportunities at the host institution	There are minor concerns regarding the career development opportunities at the host institution	Host institution has demonstrated career development opportunities for the research team	Host institution has outstanding career development opportunities for the research team
a) there is a system of onboarding and planning for the research team at the start the grant, that includes understanding and supporting the commitments of the grant	A system of onboarding is missing or unclear	There are major concerns regarding the onboarding system	There are minor concerns regarding the onboarding system	A good system of onboarding and planning for the research team is in place, that includes understanding and supporting the commitments of the award	An outstanding system of onboarding and planning for the research team is in place, that includes understanding and supporting the commitments of the award
b) Training is available to the research team in matters such as responsible conduct of research, research leadership, people	Available training for members of the research team is missing or unclear	There are major concerns regarding the training for members of the research team	There are minor concerns regarding the training for members of the research team	RRI training is available to the research team in several topics	Outstanding RRI training is available to the research team in several topics

management, equity, diversity and inclusion, promotion of a healthy research culture, ..

c) the host institution subscribes to the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment underpinning CoARA

subscription to the agreement is missing or unclear

There are major concerns regarding the subscription to the agreement

There are minor concerns regarding the subscription to the agreement

The host institution subscribes to the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment underpinning CoARA

The host institution subscribes to the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment underpinning CoARA, and has clear demonstratable actions in this regard