

MSCA RISE

Nedostaci projektnih prijedloga

PROJEKTI KOJI SU PROŠLI PRAG

Excellence

- ✓ The innovative aspects of the research are not sufficiently highlighted and explicitly described.
- ✓ The description of the methodology is not detailed enough.
- ✓ Insufficient information is provided to fully evaluate the quality of the transfer of knowledge between the different participants.
- ✓ Although some interactions between partner organizations are presented, they are not sufficiently described or justified in the proposal.
- ✓ The contribution of each participant in terms of expertise being provided is not presented in sufficient detail.
- ✓ The potential to provide new career perspectives and boost the researcher's personal development is not presented in sufficient detail.

Impact

- ✓ The communication and dissemination plan is not explicitly detailed.
- ✓ The enhancement of human resources and skills is not described adequately in terms of supporting the potential of individuals and providing new career perspectives.
- ✓ The means by which a self-sustaining partnership can be supported after the end of the project are not clearly described.
- ✓ The contribution of the project to the improvement of research and innovation potential within Europe or worldwide is not convincingly addressed.
- ✓ Specific measures for public outreach are not credibly presented.

Implementation

- ✓ The competences of the participants are not described in sufficient detail.
- ✓ The allocation of the people and the budget has not been justified convincingly and in sufficient detail.

- ✓ Some of the industry partners are of very small size, which may pose risks to the project; this aspect has not been properly addressed.
- ✓ The work plan contains limited details of the distribution of tasks and resources between participants and the exact roles of the seconded researchers in the project. The tasks associated with the "Transfer of Innovation" work package are not clearly described (for instance, the activities involved in the "Capacity Tours" and "Training Tours").
- ✓ The financial management of the project is insufficiently described in the proposal.

PROJEKTI KOJI NISU PROŠLI PRAG

Excellence

- ✓ There is no clear description of the state of the art in this field.
- ✓ Some of the disciplines cited to justify the multidisciplinary nature of the research (e.g. sociology, public health) is insufficiently demonstrated.
- ✓ The methodological aspects of the research are not explained in detail and the description of the state of the art is not well linked to the specific objectives of the project.
- ✓ The overall experimental research plan is insufficiently detailed.
- ✓ The innovative aspects of the proposed work are not sufficiently justified and the innovation of the planned activities is not convincingly demonstrated.
- ✓ The quality of the interactions and knowledge sharing between the participating organisations is insufficiently addressed.
- ✓ The innovative nature of the project is not sufficiently documented in the project proposal, the contribution of the proposed research with its predominantly regional focus to the state of the art is not well clarified.
- ✓ The specifics of the knowledge to be shared by each partner organization are not explained in detail, especially with regard to the knowledge exchange, which is to take place during the secondment mobilities.
- ✓ Sufficient qualitative details on the foreseen interaction across the partnership are not provided, e.g. on the interaction between groups studying specific complementary research topics. It is not sufficiently clarified, how relevant synergies will be achieved between the research groups.
- ✓ Some of the specific steps and practical measures that will be taken to achieve the project objectives are not clearly described.

Impact

- ✓ The potential impact of the transfer of knowledge or innovation at a wider European level or at a global level is inadequately justified.
- ✓ Practical means of securing collaboration beyond the duration of the project are unclearly identified. There is insufficient evidence of a clear strategic plan for lasting research collaborations.
- ✓ The skills that will be acquired by academic and non-academic staff are not sufficiently described.
- ✓ The development of new and lasting research collaborations and self-sustainability of the partnership after the lifespan of the project is not sufficiently addressed.
- ✓ A strategic component for innovation and transfer of knowledge between the project consortium and representatives from industry is insufficiently described.
- ✓ The commercial impact of the proposal is not sufficiently described.
- ✓ The contribution of the project to enhancing the human resources and skills of individuals involved in the secondment mobilities is insufficiently elaborated. It is not clear, how the desired impact is to be assured. The impact of the project on enhancing the career perspectives of involved researchers is not explained in sufficient detail.
- ✓ The mechanisms to facilitate the knowledge transfer across the partnership and the contribution of the knowledge transfer to improve the research and innovation potential at the European and global levels are not comprehensively presented, the innovativeness of the knowledge to be shared is not well documented.
- ✓ The description of the communication strategy lacks sufficient quantitative and qualitative details, e.g. the communication plan towards the policy makers.
- ✓ The dissemination plan insufficiently addresses the target groups for the project outreach.

Implementation

- ✓ Time schedule between the different work packages is incoherent, in particular applications on industrial scale are completed earlier than some research activities.
- ✓ The plan for gender balance is inadequately documented.
- ✓ Plans for taking care of incoming researchers are insufficiently described.
- ✓ The overall work plan lacks details; the allocation of tasks through the work packages is not sufficiently elaborated.
- ✓ The strategy and arrangements for management of the project are insufficiently detailed.
- ✓ The decision making, voting procedures and conflict resolution are not sufficiently addressed.
- ✓ The competences, experience and complementarity of participants are not suitably described.
- ✓ The infrastructures of participating organisations are not described in sufficient detail.

- ✓ In the secondment plan one institution plays a dominant role as a host but the rationale for this is not well explained. It is not clear if there are sufficient capacities to host the planned number of mobilities for the identified duration. The secondment mobilities are predominantly aimed at experienced researchers, which is not adequately justified in the project proposal.
- ✓ The tasks and deliverables are not specified in detail (e.g. with regard to the activities to be performed during the fellowships, the content of the proposed workshops, the focus of the papers to be prepared).
- ✓ The risk management processes are not adequately considered, the spectrum of risks, which can undermine the implementation of the project, are not elaborated in a comprehensive manner and the risk mitigation strategy is not sufficiently developed.
- ✓ The complementarity of the partners in the proposed field of research is not credibly presented, the specifics of their unique approach and expertise to the studied problem are not clearly