

MSCA ITN NAJČEŠĆI NEDOSTACI PROJEKATA

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the following award criteria:

ITN - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Networks		
Excellence	Impact	Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation
Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research programme (including inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)	Enhancing the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development	Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan , including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources (including awarding of the doctoral degrees for <i>EID</i> and <i>EJD</i> projects)
Quality and innovative aspects of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)	Contribution to structuring doctoral / early-stage research training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity , including the potential for: a) meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the doctoral/research training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field b) developing sustainable joint doctoral degree structures (for <i>EJD</i> projects only)	Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures , including quality management and risk management (with a mandatory joint governing structure for <i>EID</i> and <i>EJD</i> projects)
Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for <i>EID</i> and <i>EJD</i> projects)	Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results	Appropriateness of the infrastructure of the participating organisations
Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the programme
50%	30%	20%
Weighting		
1	2	3
Priority in case of <i>ex aequo</i>		
Please note that an overall threshold of 70% will be applied to the total weighted score.		

Excellence

- ✓ Considering the high number of industrial partners involved in the project, their input in training courses/workshops remain modest and thus the inter-sectoral aspect of this training is evaluated as not optimal.
- ✓ Individual research training activities are not clearly related to the scientific research tasks. Insufficient information is provided about the contents of meetings/training courses.
- ✓ Innovative aspects are not sufficiently addressed. It is not clear what novel solutions will be delivered as a result of the proposed research programme.
- ✓ Non-academic partner contributions to supervision are scarcely meaningful. The procedure for organizing mentorship is not defined. The cosupervision of two institutions is not defined.
- ✓ Some choices on the focus of the research programme are not convincingly justified.
- ✓ Synergy between academic and non-academic partners is not reflected enough. The contribution of the non-academic sector to the research training of individual ESR is not convincingly presented.
- ✓ The content of the job training is not fully developed.
- ✓ The description of qualifications of the supervisors and quality of supervision is not provided in sufficient detail. Some supervisors do not demonstrate track record in research and PhD supervision.
- ✓ The individual research objectives are quite diverse and not fully integrated into the entire research programme.
- ✓ The methodology of each task is not convincingly presented. The proposal gives only a general description of research aims.
- ✓ The objectives, research methodology, and approach are not sufficiently described. For example, it remains unclear which study material will be used, which laboratory analyses will be done, etc.
- ✓ The proposal does not provide clear information on how the PhD degrees will be awarded; only two beneficiaries can award this degree.
- ✓ The proposal does not sufficiently highlight the inter-sectoral (industrial, clinical) aspects of the training programme. Teaching of transferable skills to acquire inter/multidisciplinary and especially inter-sectoral aspects is not described in adequate detail. The development of skills through non-academic secondments is not planned for the majority of ESR.
- ✓ The research methodology is presented too generically. The research objectives are not adequately described and structured.
- ✓ The research program is excessively focused on the development of methodological aspects neglecting primary scientific goals.
- ✓ The scientific output, of most of the beneficiaries, is not a proof that they have the necessary background to carry out the activities of this
- ✓ The scope and methodologies of several individual research projects are not elaborated in sufficient detail.
- ✓ The training programme is insufficiently described in terms of content and activities (e.g., contents of workshops), with insufficient details on aspects such as trainers, speakers and stakeholders involved and their profiles and experience, and a thorough description of the content of the envisaged training is missing.
- ✓ There are insufficient details regarding the link of this program to specific PhD programs, e.g., their duration. In addition, PhD examinations/awards are not listed as deliverables.

Impact

- ✓ Although the IP strategy is considered, including agreements between industrial and academic partners, potential objectives of the Intellectual Protection plan are not specified.
- ✓ Although there is evidence of previous collaborations between some members of the consortium, there is no indication that the programme will deliver future training of forensic scientists in this field.
- ✓ Aspects for strengthening of European innovation capacity by meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the research training are not described convincingly. The impact on the European innovation capacity is only briefly addressed.
- ✓ Contribution of the non-academic sector in the training program is not meaningful because it is limited to some research tasks only, not to the overall program.
- ✓ Detail is lacking on the precise journals that will be aimed at for result dissemination and on the ideal conferences to share the project's outputs that would be relevant to the scientific and industry sectors.
- ✓ Dissemination strategy lacks important details and is largely unmeasurable. The precise role of each consortium member in the dissemination process is unclear. The description as regards how IPR will be secured or assigned is inadequate.
- ✓ Given the large amount of data generated by the project (and possible new findings), the scientific visibility through peer-reviewed papers in high impact journals is not sufficiently emphasized.
- ✓ Outreach activities are mentioned in generic terms only. Information regarding the individuals and institutions in charge is lacking. Not all relevant groups (e.g. authorities) are targeted in outreach activities.
- ✓ Some of the ESRs work plans are rather narrow so that these ESRs may not fully benefit from the potential of this training network. Specific actions of Career enhancement WP are not convincingly detailed.
- ✓ The contribution of the non-academic sector in order to ensure that researchers will have an extremely wide skill set is not clearly described.
- ✓ The project does not provide sufficient details regarding knowledge transfer.
- ✓ The proposal claims that training will be offered in a number of transferable skill, but this intention is not further substantiated. It does not address how potential of individuals can be raised.
- ✓ The proposal does not clearly explain how creativity and entrepreneurship of researchers will be promoted.
- ✓ The proposal does not present an adequate exploitation plan for the project results and the management of intellectual property issues.
- ✓ The proposal lacks a clear strategy for improving employability of the ESRs and it doesn't provide sufficient arguments on what are the concrete career perspectives that the project will provide to the ESRs.
- ✓ The recruitment strategy is not clear in respect to the required background for the best ESRs candidates.

Implementation

- ✓ A number of criteria in this section were not evaluated because the page limit was exceeded (as from paragraph Recruitment strategy (p. 36)). This is reflected in the score.
- ✓ A part of scientific deliverable is confidential, which limits the impact of dissemination plan.
- ✓ Allocating the leadership of a program with PhD awards to a non-academic beneficiary is not convincingly explained (e.g., associated risks are not properly addressed).
- ✓ Complementarity and uniqueness of the facilities of industrial partners are not presented enough.

- ✓ ESRs contribution to the management bodies is not forecasted.
- ✓ Hiring ESRs on M12 is too late in the life of the project if results have to be delivered by M37, these ESRs will have a lot of pressure to finish on time.
- ✓ In the research projects for WP1 involvement of children and data collection into early childhood is mentioned. There is a discrepancy between the Ethics description regarding these children between part A (p 27) and part B (p 7) of the proposal.
- ✓ Plans for progress monitoring and evaluation of the individual projects are not sufficiently elaborated.
- ✓ Risk management related to the experimental programme has slight deficiencies in contingency measures. Scientific risk management is not adequately addressed.
- ✓ Several deliverables use generic terminology, thereby questioning their thoughtful consideration and impact. Furthermore, scientific deliverables (table 3.1b) are not described in scientific output terms jeopardizing the project monitoring.
- ✓ Supervisors planning to take 3 ESRs (plus ESRs on secondment) risk being themselves overloaded and supervision of ESRs will not be at an appropriate level; particularly importantly when writing up.
- ✓ The commitment of the partner organizations to the programme is not adequately specified in the proposal, especially given the overall scope of the proposed programme.
- ✓ The conflict management is insufficiently addressed because, for example, it lacks an independent entity in case of conflict between ESRs and supervisors.
- ✓ The consortium shows a considerable gender imbalance.
- ✓ The deliverable list does not include dissemination activities and patenting.
- ✓ The ESRs' projects are not presented in numerical order which hampers reading when going back and forth within the proposal.
- ✓ The External Advisory Board does not seem to be fully independent.
- ✓ The frequency of Supervisory Board meetings is unclear and incoherently outlined.
- ✓ The identified risks are only a few of the possible ones and there is no clear indication on mechanism for handling possible unexpected scientific and administrative issues, e.g. ESRs withdrawing, results not complying with expected hypothesis...
- ✓ The information given about the progress monitoring and evaluation of individual projects fails to presents details such as the selection criteria, etc.
- ✓ The infrastructure and equipment for formal and informal meetings between fellows and scientist are not properly described.
- ✓ The joint governing structure includes a number of different bodies, among which both the interaction and the hierarchical relationship, particularly in the context of the decision making, is procedurally complex and would be slow in practice.
- ✓ The Management structure is adequate but it is missing the description of the decision-making process.
- ✓ The proposal does not provide clear information on the consortium composition and the exploitation of partners' complementarities.
- ✓ The voting structure and how disagreements will be dealt with within the supervisory board are not adequately discussed.
- ✓ The work packages are only led by academic beneficiaries; this raises a concern on the management input of the industrial partners.
- ✓ There are a few typo/formatting errors - it is not clear what management structure will the network implement.
- ✓ There is an unequal distribution of ESRs among the beneficiaries without proper justification (more than 50% of the ESRs are allocated to only two of them).