



FFG

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Individual Fellowships

Understanding the proposal structure: **Part B**

FOR ORIENTATION: THE PROPOSAL PACKAGE



Part A „administrative forms“

General information, participants & contacts, budget, ethics table, call-specific questions
→ including an abstract á 2000 characters

Part B „the Proposal“

Start Page

„document 1“

Table of Contents

List of Participating Organisations

1 Excellence

2 Impact

3 Implementation, incl. Gantt Chart

4 CV of the Experienced Researcher

„document 2“

5 Capacities of the Participating Organisations

6 Ethical Aspects

7 Letter of Commitment of Partner Organisations → GF only!

OVERVIEW



- Layout and Structure of the Proposal – Part B
- Section 1 „Excellence“
- Section 2 „Impact“
- Section 3 „Implementation“ and Sections 4-7

3... 2... 1... ! WHAT YOU NEED TO START !



- 1) The **current MSCA Work Programme 2016-2017!**
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2016_2017/main/h2020-wp1617-msca_en.pdf
p. 4-6 (introduction) and p. 34-37 (IF 2017 call description)
- 2) The **current Guide for Applicants (GfA)!**
H2020-MSCA-IF-2017
Date of publication: 11 April 2017
Version: 1.4
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/msca-if-2017.html>
→ Topic conditions and documents → 8. Additional documents
- 3) The **current Proposal Templates:**
Part A: Administrative Forms → tomorrow
Part B: Project description → Download from the Participant Portal after registration for the call!!!
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/msca-if-2017.html>

A blue speech bubble with a white border, containing text in blue. The text is arranged in a list-like fashion, with 'Standard-' at the top, followed by 'EF or CAR', 'or RI or SE', and 'or GF?' at the bottom.

Standard-
EF or CAR
or RI or SE
or GF?

PART B: LAYOUT

Page formatting
checked by REA
– If not OK →
reformatting

Download
template
from the PP
after
registration

Instructions for the layout of Part B in GfA, point 8 (p.28 ff.)

- use **headings** as indicated in the proposal template
- general font size **min. 11 pt** („easy to read“ as Arial, TNR etc.)
- **Gantt chart and tables**: font size min. 8
- **single line** spacing
- **margins** min. 1,5 cm
- **footnote**: only for literature references: font 8, counts towards page limit!
- **header**: proposal acronym & fellowship type (standard EF, CAR, RI, SE or GF)
- **footer**: page numbering „Part B - Page X of Y“

No other
info in the
footnotes!

PART B - STRUCTURE

Submitted
as pdf
documents



FFG

document B-1

Start Page

Table of Contents

List of Participating Organisations

1 Excellence *starts on page 4*

2 Impact

3 Implementation, incl. Gantt Chart

*1 whole page
each*

max. 10 pages !!!

*max. 13
pages*

Excess
pages
disregarded

document B-2

4 CV of the Experienced Researcher } *max. 5 pages*

5 Capacities of the Participating Organisations } *max. 1 p. / organisation*

6 Ethical Aspects } *no page limit*

7 Letter of Commitment of Partner Organisations } *GF only!*

If not
included →
inadmissible

OVERVIEW



- ✓ Layout and Structure of the Proposal – Part B
- **Section 1 „Excellence“**
- Section 2 „Impact“
- Section 3 „Implementation“ and Sections 4-7

PART B – LIST OF PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS



Participating organisations	Legal Entity Short Name	Academic (tick)	Non-academic (tick)	Country	Dept./ Division / Laboratory	Supervisor	Role of Partner Organisation ¹
<u>Beneficiary</u>							
NAME							
<u>Partner Organisation</u>							
NAME							insert here role of the partner organisation (Relevant for GF or EF secondment organisation, if you have one)

If secondment host not yet known, indicate if „academic“ or “non-academic“

keep the dark grey parts blank

! Any **inter-relationship** between the participating organisation(s) or individuals and other entities/persons (e.g. family ties, shared premises or facilities, joint ownership, financial interest, overlapping staff or directors, etc.) must be declared and justified in this part of the proposal.

[1] For example, hosting secondments, for GF hosting the outgoing phase etc.

PART B – DATA FOR NON-ACADEMIC BENEFICIARIES



Name	Location of research premises (city / country)	Type of R&D activities	No. of full - time employees	No. of employees in R&D	Web site	Annual turnover (approx. in Euro)	Enterprise status (Yes/No)	SME status ² (Yes/No)

- Information must be based on **current data, not projections**
- Information about the **capacity** of participating organisations is **checked during the grant preparation phase**

^[2] As defined in [Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC](#)

„The principles of the **European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (Charter and Code)** promoting **open recruitment and attractive working and employment conditions** should be applied by all the funded participants.“

Check if your
IF host
organisation(s)
endorsed the
C&C

Cf. MSCA work programme 2016-2017, page 4
<https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter>

https://cdn2.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/brochures/am509774cee_en_e4.pdf



1.1 Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action (level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects) (1/2)

- Introduction, state-of-the-art, objectives and overview of the action
- Research methodology and approach: highlight type of research/ innovation activities proposed
- Originality and innovative aspects of the research programme:
 - How does it contribute to advancements in the field?
 - Any novel concepts, approaches or methods?

Use headlines and keep with the questions

If it fits your proposal, arrange this description along work packages



1.1 Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action (level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects) (2/2)

- The gender dimension in the research content (if relevant)
- The interdisciplinary aspects of the action (if relevant)
- How will the high-quality research open up career possibilities for the ER and new collaboration opportunities for the host organisation(s)



Research – Strengths

- ✓ This is a **high-quality, timely and credible** proposal based on a strong scientific premise
- ✓ The **objectives** of the project are **clearly described** and detailed
- ✓ The **state-of-the-art** of the research field, as well as **gaps** in existing knowledge and solutions, are very well explained
- ✓ The proposed **research methods** are at the cutting edge of research
- ✓ The **gender-specific issues** are adequately addressed and are in accordance with the project aims
- ✓ The approach is of clear **interdisciplinary** and **inter-sectorial** (academic/clinical) nature



Research – Weaknesses

- ✗ The **innovative aspects** of the research are not convincingly demonstrated
- ✗ The **state-of-the art** and the **methodology** are poorly described
- ✗ The scientific **track record of the researcher** does not sufficiently detail their experience in relevant research fields to support the success of the action



1.2 Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

- Describe the training that will be offered

1) E.g. training through research, hands-on training (techniques, big data, IPR...), inter-sectoral/interdisciplinary ToK...
2) Transferable skills: management, organising events, communication and outreach, gender issues...

- Outline how a two way transfer of knowledge will occur between the researcher and the host institution(s)
 - Explain how the ER will gain new knowledge during the fellowship at the hosting organisation(s)
 - Outline the previously acquired knowledge and skills that the researcher will transfer to the host organisation(s)

For GF: Explain how the newly acquired skills and knowledge in the TC will be transferred back to Europe during the incoming phase



Training – Strengths

- ✓ The training is **well planned** and of high quality and includes **secondments** and a number of **courses** held at the host institution
- ✓ There are plans for additional training in **transferable skills**, including "on-the-job" training in communication, scientific writing, supervision/mentoring and scientific management
- ✓ The **table** in which the researcher lists the **benefits of both the host and the researcher** is extremely clear
- ✓ A clear explanation of the **contribution of the researcher to the host** is provided (**GF**)



Training – Weaknesses

- ✗ The **interdisciplinary** aspects of the training activities are not addressed satisfactorily
- ✗ Specific measures to **integrate the researcher into the group's** different aspects of expertise are not clearly defined
- ✗ There is insufficient mention of **networking opportunities**, especially at an international level
- ✗ The proposal does not sufficiently outline the expected **complementarity of the outgoing and incoming host** groups. The transfer of previously acquired **knowledge from the researcher to the hosts** is insufficiently described (**GF**)



1.3 Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team / institution (1/2)

■ Qualifications and experience of the supervisor(s)

Information regarding the supervisor(s):

- level of experience on the research topic proposed
- track record of work
- main international collaborations
- level of experience in supervising researchers (PhD, Postdocs)
- participation in projects, publications, patents and any other relevant results

Balance and link with section 5 „role and profile of key persons“

Mind the context of your research and training objectives – your project and profile

1.3 Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team / institution (2/2)

Not infrastructure!
For this → section 2

■ Hosting arrangements

- show that the **ER will be well integrated** in the team/institution so that **all parties gain the maximum knowledge and skills** from the fellowship
- outline the **nature and the quality of the research group / environment as a whole**
- **measures to integrate the researcher** in the different areas, disciplines and international networking opportunities

For GF: describe for both outgoing and incoming phase

- outgoing: **practical arrangements to host a researcher** from another country
- incoming: measures for the **successful (re)-integration** of the ER



Supervision – Strengths

- ✓ Both **supervisor and co-supervisor** have a very impressive **track record in supervisory experience** and are **highly qualified in the subject domain** in which the research is located
- ✓ The project **host's** experience, **partner** organization's profile and the **researcher's** knowledge will **complement** well each other
- ✓ The host group provides an exceptional environment for **international networking**
- ✓ The proposal provides convincing evidence for a very good **integration of the researcher** in the research team at the host institutions (both **abroad and in Europe**), including international networking opportunities (**GF**)



Supervision – Weaknesses

- ✘ The application lacks a convincing description of **hosting and integration arrangements** for the researcher
- ✘ The plan inadequately describes the competences of the Supervisor about the specific research content
- ✘ The application does not provide sufficient information on the past supervising experience of the main and co-supervisors

PART B – SECTION 1 „EXCELLENCE“

Balance this information with section 4 – your CV

1.4 Capacity of the researcher to reach and re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence

- Demonstrate how the professional experience of the ER and the proposed research will **contribute to the ERs development** as an independent/mature researcher **during** the fellowship
- A complete **Career Development Plan NOT to be included** in the proposal, but part of the implementation of the action

The fellowships will be awarded to the most talented researchers as shown by the proposed research and their track record in relation to their level of experience

CDP: devised to develop and widen the competences of the ER, particularly in terms of multi/interdisciplinary/inter-sectoral expertise and transferable skills

SECTION 1 – EXERCISE

Take 5 min to think about how you can **break down** your project idea/work **into Workpackages!**



Definition: a Workpackage (WP) is a major subdivision of the proposed project

OVERVIEW



- ✓ Layout and Structure of the Proposal – Part B
- ✓ Section 1 „Excellence“
- **Section 2 „Impact“**
- Section 3 „Implementation“ and Sections 4-7

FOR ORIENTATION – PART B Impact



Start Page

Table of Contents

List of Participating Organisations

1 Excellence

2 Impact

3 Implementation, incl. Gantt Chart

*Part B
document 1*

4 CV of the Experienced Researcher

5 Capacities of the Participating Organisations

6 Ethical Aspects

7 Letter of Commitment of Partner Organisations

*Part B
document 2*

PART B – SECTION 2 „IMPACT“



Balance this information with your CV (section 4) and, with 1.4

2.1 Enhancing the potential and future career prospects researcher

- Explain the expected impact of the planned research and training on the future career prospects of the experienced researcher after the fellowship.
- Describe the added value of the fellowship on the future career opportunities of the researcher.
- Which new competences and skills will be acquired? How should these make the researcher more successful?

If „more experienced“ – convincing arguments for further career development



Career perspectives – Strengths

- ✓ Specific courses will develop the researcher's networking, project management and mentoring/supervision abilities
- ✓ The training and development plan encompasses transferable skills that will enhance the researcher's career prospects
- ✓ The proposal provides a full description of how the fellowship would enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher
- ✓ During the return phase to the EU, the researcher will bring back increased expertise in machine learning, a new competence primarily available in the outgoing host institution (GF)



Career perspectives – Weaknesses

- ✗ The expected impact of the fellowship is low. There will only be limited advancement of the researcher in new scientific methodology and management skills
- ✗ Professional career plans, other than further applications for fellowships, are not sufficiently evinced
- ✗ It is unclear how specifically the planned research and training would benefit future career plans
- ✗ It has not been demonstrated enough how a higher career position in academia will be achieved by the researcher. It is also not adequately described how the competence for securing additional international grants will be acquired.
- ✗ New competencies acquired are not sufficiently defined

EXERCISE ON 2.1



FFG

Think about it (5')

What impact will the project have for your career – once it is finished? („post-fellowship“)? Which new skills and competencies will you have developed, including transferable skills?

Why are these relevant for your career?

Write it down and have a short chat about this with your neighbour later on (5')

PART B – Sections 2.2 & 2.3



Dissemination \neq Communication



Section 2.2

Dissemination

targeted at **peers - scientific** or the „the wider research and innovation community“, industry and other commercial actors, professional organisations, policymakers

- communicate research results, transfer them into other research settings, for commercial purposes or policy making

Examples

- papers at conferences
- publications in journals
- open data

Section 2.3

Communication

targeted at the **general public**

- to create awareness among the general public about the project and its results, implications for citizens and society
- done in a way that this can be understood by non-specialists
- for the researcher to understand better public concern and interest

Examples („one-way“ – „two-way“)

- press articles
- researchers' night
- blogs & videos...



Open Access

- **mandatory** for all H2020 funded projects
- **What does it mean?** Peer-reviewed scientific publications resulting from IF funding are deposited in open access repositories, i.e. free of charge online access for the user. A repository number for each publication must be provided in project reports.

Open Research Data pilot in H2020

- **No obligation** on IF projects to participate in the pilot!
- Decision whether yes/no to participate: during submission (part A)
- if yes: data management plan required in the first 6 months of the action

For further information see documents section of the PP:

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf

PART B – SECTION 2 „IMPACT“



2.2 Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate results

- Describe how the new knowledge generated by the action will be **disseminated and exploited**, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, **if appropriate, commercialised**.
- Describe, **when relevant**, how intellectual property rights will be dealt with

!!! Concrete plans for 2.2 → into the Gantt Chart section 3.1



Dissemination – Weaknesses

- ✗ The proposed **dissemination of research results** to scientific community is **not sufficiently addressed**
- ✗ **International conferences** where the researcher would present their results are **not clearly articulated**
- ✗ The [...] proposed peer reviewed journals, monograph series and conferences are **not properly identified and specified**
- ✗ The **proposal insufficiently details** the organization of seminars, the number of publications that the proposed research would deliver and the international conferences where results would be disseminated.

PART B – SECTION 2 „IMPACT“

2.3 Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

The frequency and nature of communication activities should be outlined in the proposal. Concrete plans for the above must be included as deliverable

for inspiration

Concrete plans for 2.3 → into the Gantt Chart section 3.1

communication & outreach – public engagement → towards „different target audiences“ → “society at large“, „non-specialist“



Outreach and Communication Activities in the MSCA under Horizon 2020

Guidelines

MSCA fellows are expected to engage in outreach activities as an integral part of their fellowship. Below is a non-exhaustive set of practical outreach activities that MSCA fellows could consider for their project.

Difference between communication and outreach

Outreach and communication activities are related, but are not the same and a good MSCA project should include a mix of both.

Outreach activities are meant to engage a large audience and to bring knowledge and expertise on a particular topic to the general public. Outreach activities can take several forms, such as school presentations, workshops, public talks and lab visits, etc. The objective of outreach is to explain the benefits of research to a larger public (the tax payers who fund your research). Outreach implies an interaction between the sender and the receiver of the message, there is an engagement and a two-way communication between the researcher and the public.

Communication, on the other hand, only goes in one direction from the sender to the receiver. Communication refers to articles in *mainstream* newspapers and magazines, or on TV and radio channels. Successful communication requires a clear language and attractive scientific subject with outstanding results that can catch the media's attention.

The European Commission is aware that not every MSCA researcher is undertaking research of interest to the mass media. You can start small and attempt having your research published in your local newspaper. Researchers should be able to explain their project to the large public in *accessible language*: imagine having to explain what you do to fellow commuters on your daily trip to work.

Possible activities

In order to give visibility to MSCA projects, fellows could take part in outreach activities such as:

- **Marie Skłodowska-Curie Ambassadors:** Fellows acting as "Ambassadors" organise activities with the aim of promoting their research to all public audiences. MSCA researchers visit schools and universities or assist educators in

EXERCISE ON 2.3



If you are a potential Fellow: Take 5' and think of some activities to communicate your research to the wider public. **Try to be specific: To whom, how & how often?**

You are from Research Support Services or a Supervisor (PI)? Think of activities and practical support at your institution to communicate research to the wider public.

Take another 10' to share your ideas at your table.



Communication – Weaknesses

- ✗ The proposal **does not persuasively expand on how it will provide** targeted information to multiple audiences
- ✗ **Specific** communication actions are **insufficient in their details**
- ✗ The proposal **does not provide specific information** about basic outreach strategies like Twitter, blogposts, social media campaigns, TV, radio, public science festivals etc. that could reach a wider audience
- ✗ The dissemination strategy for the new knowledge fails to fully and comprehensively engage different target groups (SE-Panel)

OVERVIEW



- ✓ Layout and Structure of the Proposal – Part B
- ✓ Section 1 „Excellence“
- ✓ Section 2 „Impact“
- **Section 3 „Implementation“ and Sections 4-7**

FOR ORIENTATION – Part B



*Part B
document 1*

Start Page

Table of Contents

List of Participating Organisations

1 Excellence

2 Impact

3 Implementation, incl. Gantt Chart

*Part B
document 2*

4 CV of the Experienced Researcher

5 Capacities of the Participating Organisations

6 Ethical Aspects

7 Letter of Commitment of Partner Organisations (GF only)



3.1 Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

! Design the proposal in a way to achieve the desired impact !
& include a Gantt Chart and a list of the following items:

- **Work Packages titles** (minimum 1 WP for EF)
- **List of major deliverables, if applicable**
- **List of major milestones, if applicable**
- **Secondments, if applicable**

! The schedule should be in terms of **number of months elapsed** from the start of the project.



DEFINITION

Work package (WP): a major subdivision of the proposed project

Optional – Work Package Description (Example)

Work Package Number		Start Month – End Month
Work Package Title	(e.g. including Research, Training, Management, Communication and Dissemination...)	
Description (possibly broken down into tasks)		
Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)		



DEFINITION

Deliverable: a distinct output of the action (e.g. report, document, technical diagram, software, etc.)

- ordered according to **delivery dates**
- **numbering convention:**
<WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>

Examples

D1.2: Career development plan (as 2nd deliverable of WP 1)

D4.3: Publication of result X in top-ranking journal

D4.4: Data Management Plan



Deliverables List – Example

Number ¹	Title	Nature ²	Delivery Month ³	Work Package No.	Description
1.1					
1.2					
2.1					
...					

[1] Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates.

[2] Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

R=Report; **ADM**=Administrative (website completion, recruitment completion...); **PDE**=dissemination/exploitation;
OTHER=Other including coordination

[3] Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).



DEFINITION

Milestone: control point in the action that help to chart progress, e.g. completion of a key deliverable, intermediary points where corrective measures can be taken, a critical decision point for further development etc.

Examples:

M 1.1: Test phase concluded

M 2.3: Map completed & published



Milestones List – Example

Number	Title	Related Work Package(s)	Month ¹	Description ²

^[1] Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

^[2] Show how you will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype completed and running flawlessly; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated.

EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESR) – SELECTED COMMENTS



FFG



Work plan – Strengths

- ✓ The work plan is **well-structured and detailed**
- ✓ The work plan is **coherent with the objectives** and the proposed actions
- ✓ There is **clear connection between tasks, milestones and deliverables**
- ✓ The timeframes allocated to the individual tasks are reasonable and well-explained for each individual milestone.
- ✓ The **secondment is relevant**, appropriately planned and integrated into the work plan



Work plan – Weaknesses

- ✘ Important milestones and deliverables are **not well reflected in the Gantt chart**, negatively impacting on the effectiveness of the work plan
- ✘ **Work packages for the training activities**, including soft skills and dissemination and outreach activities are not well defined
- ✘ Information about **deliverables and milestones** is insufficient
- ✘ Credibility and feasibility of the work plan are not sufficiently explained. The **time-line plan is overly ambitious**.
- ✘ The **secondments** planned in the project are not clearly included in the work plan nor in the Gantt chart

SECTION 3 IMPLEMENTATION: Tasks & Resources

3.2 Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- Describe how the work planning and the resources mobilised will ensure that the research and training objectives will be reached.
- Explain why the amount of person-months is appropriate in relation to the activities proposed.



SECTION 3 IMPLEMENTATION: Management & Risks



3.3 Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management

Describe

- the organisation and management structure, as well as the progress monitoring mechanisms put in place, to ensure that objectives are reached.
- the research and/or administrative risks that might endanger reaching the action objectives and the contingency plans to be put in place should risk occur
- Involvement of entity with a capital or legal link to the beneficiary (in particular, name of the entity, type of link with the beneficiary and tasks to be carried out), if applicable

EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESR) – SELECTED COMMENTS



FFG

Tasks - Strengths

- ✓ The effective allocation of tasks and resources which would ensure the project's successful implementation is presented convincingly

MGT structure incl. Risks - Strengths

- ✓ The management structure is **well defined and adequate** to ensure a smooth action implementation
- ✓ The **host institution** provides appropriate monitoring mechanisms of the project implementation
- ✓ Project management will benefit from the assistance of dedicated **Human Resources offices** from both institutions (GF)
- ✓ There is a **well-outlined risk management plan**, providing suggestions for **suitable alternative strategies**



Tasks – Weaknesses

- ✗ The proposal **does not adequately explain the allocation of person-months** across the work packages / the allocation of resources to **dissemination activities**

MGT structure incl. Risks – Weaknesses

- ✗ The managing structure, including the interaction between researcher and supervisor, is **not explained in sufficient detail**. Monitoring of the progress of the researcher is not well addressed
- ✗ **Risk analysis and contingency plans** are not considered or discussed in sufficient depth
- ✗ The risk assessment **does not adequately reflect risks** related to potential budgetary issues, time over-runs, or technical issues for the phase of [...].



SECTION 3 - EXERCISE



Take 10 min to reflect on research and/or administrative **risks and possible mitigation strategies for your own project**

SECTION 3 IMPLEMENTATION: Infrastructure



FFG

Remember Section 1.3
(Supervision)
Balance also with Section 5
(Capacity of the participating
organisations)

3.4 Appropriateness of the institutional environment

Description of the active contribution of the beneficiary to the research and training activities.

For GF also the role of partner organisations in the outgoing phase should appear. → Link to Letter of Commitment Section 7

- Give a description of the main tasks and commitments of the beneficiaries and all partner organisations (if applicable)
- Describe the infrastructure, logistics, facilities offered in as far as they are necessary for the good implementation of the action.



Infrastructure - Strengths

- ✓ All the **facilities** that will become available to the researcher are of **superior quality**
- ✓ The host institution complies with **high standards of scientific and staff management**
- ✓ The host organisation is very **well equipped to handle** international projects
- ✓ The infrastructure and facilities offer a **highly supportive institutional environment** for the conduct of the research
- ✓ The **commitment of the hosts and the supervisors** to the project is well demonstrated (GF)



Infrastructure – Weaknesses

- ✘ The proposal does not adequately address the tasks, commitments or infrastructure of one of the two **secondment hosts**
- ✘ The logistic and facilities given by the hosts institutions to the researcher are described in a **generic way** referring to protocols but without particular **details in relation to the implementation of this specific project**

SECTION 4 - RESEARCHER`S CV



“Intrinsic to the evaluation”

- Assessed throughout the 3 evaluation criteria
- Consistence between Part A & Part B!
- Standard academic and research record
- Research career gaps and/or unconventional paths should be clearly explained – for fair assessment by the evaluators
- Additional table for applicants without doctorate

SECTION 4 - RESEARCHER'S CV



FFG

max. 5 pages

The *experienced researcher* must provide a list of achievements reflecting their track record, if applicable:

1. **Publications** in peer-reviewed scientific journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings and/or monographs of their respective research fields, indicating also the number of citations (excluding self-citations) they have attracted.
2. Granted **patent(s)**.
3. **Research monographs, chapters** in collective volumes and any translations thereof.
4. **Invited presentations** to peer-reviewed, internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools.
5. **Research expeditions** led by that the *experienced researcher*.
6. **Organisation of International conferences** in the field of the researcher (membership in the steering and/or programme committee).
7. Examples of **participation in industrial innovation**.
8. **Prizes and Awards**.
9. **Funding** received so far.
10. **Supervising and mentoring** activities.

CV should be relevant to the proposal



SECTION 5 - CAPACITY OF THE PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS

Beneficiary X	
General Description	
Role and Profile of key persons (supervisor)	<i>(names, title, qualifications of the main supervisor)</i>
Key Research Facilities, Infrastructure and Equipment	<i>Demonstrate that the beneficiary has sufficient facilities and infrastructure to host and/or offer a suitable environment for training and transfer of knowledge to the recruited experienced researcher If applicable, indicate the name of the entity with a capital or legal link to the beneficiary and its role in the action.</i>
Independent research premises?	<i>Please explain the status of the beneficiary's research facilities – i.e. are they owned by the beneficiary or rented by it? Are its research premises wholly independent from other entities? If applicable, indicate the name of the entity with a capital or legal link to the beneficiary and describe the link..</i>
Previous Involvement in Research and Training Programmes	<i>Detail any (maximum 5) relevant EU and/or national research and training programmes in which the beneficiary has previously participated</i>
Current involvement in Research and Training Programmes	<i>Detail the EU and/or national research and training programmes in which the beneficiary is currently participating</i>
Relevant Publications and/or research/innovation products	<i>(Max 5) Only list items (co-)produced by the supervisor</i>

host in Europe
max. 1 page
min. font size 8

show the experience & capacity of the host in providing training for experienced researchers



SECTION 5 - CAPACITY OF THE PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS

Partner Organisation Y	
General description	
Key Persons and Expertise (supervisor)	
Key Research facilities, infrastructure and equipment	
Previous and Current Involvement in Research and Training Programmes	
Relevant Publications and/or research/innovation product	(Max 3)

GF: outgoing host outside Europe; secondment host in Europe

*max. 1 page per partner organisation
min. font size 8*

keep information relevant to the research & training objectives & your project

SECTION 6 – ETHICAL ISSUES



Applicants should demonstrate that they are aware of and will comply with European & national legislation and fundamental ethical principles

- Clearly identify potential ethical issues in the proposal and detail how these will be addressed!
- Ethics Issues Table in Part A → if ethical issue is flagged, ethical self-assessment is necessary here in Section 6.

SECTION 7 – LETTER OF COMMITMENT (GF only!)



For Global Fellowships the partner organisations in third countries must include a letter of commitment

- No template → Minimum requirements:
 - heading or stamp of the institution
 - up-to-date (after call publication)
 - demonstrate the will to actively participate in the (identified) action and the precise role
- The scanned copies of the LoC must be included within the PDF file of part B (not attached in a separate file or embedded)

should match with information given in the proposal text – “demonstrate the will”

!!! Proposals failing the above-mentioned requirements will be declared inadmissible !!!

USEFUL INFORMATION

Check also the list of
useful links given in
the GfA



MSCA Individual Fellowships (European & Global) Checklist on information required from host organisations

General remarks on terms used in MSCA

European Fellowship (EF)

- The host organisation (= beneficiary) is located in an EU Member State (MS) or in a H2020-Associated country (AC). It is the official coordinator of the project and has the status “beneficiary”, signs the Grant Agreement and employs the fellow.
- Apart from this, “Partner Organisations” located in MS/AC can be involved. They provide training and host researchers during secondments.

Global Fellowship (GF)

- There are two host organisations: One for the “outgoing phase” (12-24 months), and one for the “return period” (12 months).
- The host of the outgoing phase is located in a “Third Country” (TC – not MS or AC) and has the status “Partner Organisation”.
- The host for the “return phase” is located in an EU Member State (MS) or H2020-Associated Country

Disclaimer

All text, images and graphics are subject to copyright. Publication or use - whether in part or whole - is permitted only with express written consent from Österr. Forschungsförderungsgesellschaft mbH. We can not accept responsibility for the correctness, accuracy or completeness of the information offered. Any liability for damages that have been caused by the use or non-use of the information offered or by inaccurate or incomplete information is precluded.