

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

MSCA-IF

CONTENIDO

1. EXCELLENCE **1**

- 1.1. Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects).
- 1.2. Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of research in light of the research objectives.
- 1.3. Quality of the supervision.
- 1.4. Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research.

2. IMPACT **3**

- 2.1. Enhancing research – and innovation – related human resource, skills, and working conditions to realise the potential individuals and to provide new career perspectives.
- 2.2. Effectiveness of the proposed measures to communication and results dissemination.

3. IMPLEMENTATION **5**

- 3.1. Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources.
- 3.2. Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management.
- 3.3. Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure).
- 3.4. Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment.

EXCELLENCE

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

1.1. Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)

The proposal satisfactorily puts the project in the context of the state-of-the-art, which demonstrates both its timeliness and originality.	The research plan scheduled lacks credibility, due to the multiple complex aims proposed. In fact, such aims are quite ambitious and difficult to be achieved in the timeframe proposed.
The proposal is largely based on interdisciplinary knowledge of the applicant and the host.	The description of the state-of-the-art of the envisaged research domain lacks information on relevant recent approaches.
The main research objective and proposed methodology are clearly presented.	The innovative aspects of the research are not sufficiently emphasized and/or demonstrated.
The match between the researcher's profile and project is demonstrated.	Certain objectives and parts of the methodology are not elaborated in sufficient detail and/or are written in an unclear manner.
	The credibility of the proposed approach and methodology are limit. There are very few samples for each class to construct reliable rules. In addition, how benchmarking would be done is not clearly described.
	The research description is insufficiently grounded in related current research; there is limited reference to recent research journal papers to evidence the relevance and credibility of the proposal.
	Terminological definitions are not fully accounted for in the proposal description.
	The expected outcomes from de project are not presented in sufficient clarity.

1.2. Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of research in light of the research objectives.

Training in complementary skills in both academic and non-academic sectors, is very well formulated and extremely relevant for the applicant.	Training on technical and scientific aspects is reported with insufficient detail.
The host will benefit from the applicant's extensive knowledge and experience and the applicant will transfer expertise gained.	Transfer of knowledge plans are loosely structured.
The host organization arrangement provides a series of competences that will be useful to the applicant during the development of the fellowship.	It is not well elaborated how all parties would gain the maximum knowledge and skills from the proposal

Adequate quality of transfer of knowledge and its relevance to the research objectives is outlined.	Hosting arrangements to carry out the project are not properly explained
1.3. Quality of the supervision	
The level of experience of the supervisor, including this track record has been convincingly described.	The international collaborations of the supervisor that will help the applicant in establish new relevant scientific cooperation have not been satisfactorily detailed.
The quality of supervision and mentoring is certified by the supervisors, and host's involvement in prestigious awards and training grants.	No information on patents eventually filed by the supervisor has been provided.
The supervision is adequately structured in terms of research-for-training formula	There is not enough information about the number of doctoral and postdoctoral researchers that have been supervised by the team leader
	Whether the principal supervisor has plausible track record of publications and previous training achievements in this field is not demonstrated.
1.4. Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research	
The fellowship will allow the integration of the applicant back to Europe and will strengthen the applicant's expertise and collaboration network in order to achieve an independent career.	The capacity of the applicant to reach professional maturity is not sufficiently demonstrated, as the researcher has a limited number of publications.
The applicant present a remarkable quality and number of scientific publications as well as international research experience. The CV clearly documents a long lasting interest in the scientific field of the project.	Leadership qualities are only partially demonstrated. Independent activities of the researcher are insufficiently demonstrated.
The applicant demonstrates the ability to transfer knowledge and collaborate efficiently in research teams, as shown from the applicant's international experience.	The proposal provides insufficient information on the role and responsibilities of senior scientists in the supervision of the project.
The successful completion of the project will be a good starting point to apply for a more senior position.	
The researcher has the capacity to reach professional maturity.	

IMPACT

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

2.1. Enhancing research – and innovation – related human resource, skills, and working conditions to realise the potential individuals and to provide new career perspectives.

The proposal outlines the potential scientific and socio-economic benefits to the community arising from the successful implementation of the project.	The expected impact of the research to be developed along the fellowship on the career prospect of the applicant has been sufficiently described.
The project is expected to foster interdisciplinary training in the domain of sensors and other applications.	It was clearly stated how the new competences that will be gained through the fellowship could increase significantly the applicant's scientific profile.
The competencies which will be acquired during the fellowship are expected to provide a stimulating environment for the training and professional development of the researcher at a high level resulting in novel opportunities for the applicant's career.	There is an insufficient description of how the fellowship may help the applicant to reach professional maturity.
The project will be highly beneficial for the applicant.	The proposal does not clearly present future plans for the applicant's career progression beyond the life of the project.
The fellowship will have an impact on their career by providing interdisciplinary knowledge and technical skills which lead to innovation.	The potential impact of the proposed research at European level is not made sufficiently clear.
It further offers a network of professional collaborators in Europe in order to pursue and independent research career.	It is unclear how the project will contribute to strengthen the research management and leadership abilities of the applicant.
Public engagement is linked to the host institution's outreach programme. The activities described in the proposal and stemming from the host are numerous and have a positive impact on communicating research results. Furthermore, a special dissemination unit publicizes research results through its website and press releases	
The research activities have the potential to make a significant impact on the researcher's career.	
There is a non-negligible chance that the most multidisciplinary parts of the proposal have to be abandoned, since they might turn out not to be viable. This would severely affect the impact and benefits of the fellowship.	

The proposal gives detail on training courses and workshops on transferable skills tailored to provide new career perspectives for the researcher.	
The Host organization will contribute to the development of the entrepreneur-related skills of the researcher.	
2.2. Effectiveness of the proposed measures to communication and results dissemination	
Dissemination and communication to the scientific community are well formulated and cover a wide range of activities (journals, conferences, AD associations, Master's programs).	The metric to measure the efficacy of the communication strategy has not been duly provided.
IP strategy is addressed clearly and in detail. Different possibilities to exploit and commercialize the results are described (patents, spin-off, pharmacological industries).	The strategy for the public engagement has not been convincingly presented. In fact, it was described mainly in the activities for outreach communication of the Host organization without any particular plan related to the specific theme.
The proposal includes identification of numerous channels of communication and dissemination which are relevant for the scope of the study.	Dissemination of the results towards of the stakeholders is insufficiently described. The presentation of the public engagement strategy of the action is rather generic
Dissemination activities are fully adequate covering classical academic writing (monograph and two articles), presentations at conferences and encompassing a clearly structured open source strategy.	The number of planned publications as deliverables is rather unrealistic.
The proposal provides a clear and standard dissemination plan for the researcher.	The potential exploitation of results and intellectual property are not discussed in sufficient detail.
	The communication strategy for the proposed research, especially towards non-specialists, is not clearly structured or coherent.
	The proposal lacks clarity on the long-term impact of the proposed outreach activities which are mostly limited to participation in local events.

IMPLEMENTATION

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

3.1. Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources.

A GANTT chart has been clearly illustrated. The deliverables are correctly disposed along the project development and a comprehensive list of milestones is clearly presented.	The work plan has been clearly presented. However, the second part of the fellowship present a superposition of the work packages and this raises the issue of capacity of the applicant to fulfill them simultaneously.
Very good management structure and procedures based on a credible set of deliverables and milestones.	The work to be accomplished within each WP is provided only in a generic manner. A short list of the tasks within each work package is missing.
The active contribution of the beneficiary to the research and training activities has been sufficiently described.	There are insufficient clear links between the proposed methodology and the work plan to evaluate its effectiveness. Furthermore, the provided work plan does not provide sufficient time to evaluate the reached results.
The presented workflow is balanced regarding the number of actions. It is clear that the project is feasible from this point of view.	Several deliverables are foreseen as the end result of the project. Their temporal distribution is not very well organized and their correlation with specific work packages is not clear in the provided Gantt chart.
The regular meetings with the supervisor and host group are described with enough details providing quantitative provisions for supervision and quality control. The plan for quality assessment is remarkable.	They are sequentially ordered in the chart with no overlaps. This implies that there is insufficient interaction between them.
Realistic project organisation, management structure and financial management are described.	There is insufficient consideration of objective evaluation of results.
	The secondment-related management issues during the overall action are not sufficiently addressed.
	There is not specific management and dissemination work packages and specific tasks within the work packages are not clear.
	The work plan lacks details on time lines and only brief comments on the implementation of the consecutive tasks and their interrelationships are provided.
	The allocation of resources is not adequately described in this section of the proposal.

3.2. Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management.	
How the administrative issues of the proposal will be managed by a competent and expert structure in the host organization has been clearly and convincingly described.	Risk assessment at the research level is not adequately addressed , as no potential risks are described, hence no associated contingency plans are planned
A detailed contingency plan has been convincingly presented to manage the risk of the proposed research program.	The part of the proposal concerning the risk factors is not sufficiently developed.
Risk analysis identifies one potential issue and outlines possible solution to the problem	Contingency measures for the identified risks are not sufficiently explained.
Quality management and the frequency of the meetings are described in detail and are sufficient to ensure a constant adjustment of the work plan according to the progress of research.	The secondment-related management issues during the overall action are not sufficiently addressed.
The mechanisms of monitoring the progress and quality of the project (regular meetings with the supervisor) as well as the financial management mechanisms are considered to be effective. The respective offices within the host institution would be responsible for grant agreement phase and administrative aspects.	
The practical arrangements for the financial implementation and administrative management of the fellowship are in place.	
3.3. Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure).	
The infrastructure of the host for receiving the applicant is excellent. The host has the necessary infrastructure and capabilities to guide and accommodate the applicant in the proposed project.	The hosting laboratory for the proposed secondment is not clearly identified.
Support measures and institutional infrastructure for integration of the researcher into the host laboratory team are very well outlined	
The infrastructure offered by the host institution covers a fully equipped workstation, access to libraries and laboratories as well as academic courses.	
3.4. Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment.	

The host participates in numerous international collaborations and has an ample experience in EU projects.	The proposal does not address in sufficient detail the scientific and knowledge complementarity between all participants, including the applicant.
Participating organisations are competent and experienced.	The proposal does not justify why the secondment is appropriate.
Commitment of beneficiary and partner organizations to the proposal objectives is convincingly evidenced.	The proposal fails to address in which aspects the host is unique regarding this particular field of research.



OFICINA EUROPEA I+D
UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID



OFICINA EUROPEA DE I+D, 2016

<http://oficinaeuropea.ucm.es>
h2020.gestion@ucm.es
[@OficinaEuroUCM](#)
+34 91 394 6384

Centro de Investigación y Transferencia Complutense
Calle Doctor Severo Ochoa, 7
28040 - Madrid (España)