

# EXAMPLES FROM EVALUATORS REPORTS

---

## MSCA RISE 2017 WEAKNESSES

### 2. Excellence

#### 2.1 Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects

- The proposal does not sufficiently highlight the novelty and originality of the proposed research.
- The rationale behind the selection of organisms and techniques is not justified.
- The proposal does not concretely explain and justify how the foreseen different disciplines will be integrated and, in particular, how the technical disciplines would be integrated with humanities in light of the project objectives.
- Gender aspects are not sufficiently considered and addressed.
- The proposed materials that will be investigated are mentioned but the real research contribution of the project participant is not convincingly explained in comparison to the current state-of-the-art.
- The innovative character and originality of the proposal are not sufficiently developed. A limited discussion is presented on which new ideas would be introduced beyond the proposed statements to coordinate the project targets.
- The gap that this research project is about to fill is insufficiently justified so as its innovative aspects.
- The proposal is not sufficiently novel, since similar ideas have been successfully developed for many years by other institutions in USA, Japan, South Korea (none of these being part of the consortium). For example, it is not clearly explained what will be the added value of the proposed research in comparison to other international achievements.

#### 2.2 Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives

- The knowledge transfer mechanism is not fully satisfactory because the proposal does not explain in sufficient detail the nature and function of the expected secondments, their interaction with training events and seminars/workshops, the topics of trainings and seminars. Moreover, the contribution of public sector organisations to knowledge sharing is not sufficiently clarified.
- The proposal does not provide sufficient detail on the planned secondments. For instance, it is unclear what kind of knowledge will be shared and between whom.
- The proposal does not clearly describe how the expertise of the individual visiting researchers will be integrated into the resolution of research questions.
- The knowledge sharing and integration strategy is insufficiently described and lacks a proper reintegration process after the secondments.
- There is not enough detailed information to describe how the partners will share the technical knowledge that is required for the proposed work.
- The quality and relevance of knowledge sharing is not sufficiently and clearly presented in the proposal.

## 2.3 Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations

- The communication measures are not provided with quantitative indicators to enable their impact to be reliably assessed.
- It is unclear how the interactions will strengthen the quality of the research.
- The quality of the envisaged secondments is inadequate. e.g. Details of the duration and relevance of many secondments are insufficient to guarantee effective and meaningful transfer of knowledge.
- The contribution of the partners to the project activities and the interactions between them are not sufficiently described.
- The proposed networking events are not adequately justified. Insufficient detail is presented on their context, content, relevance and contribution to the achievement of project objectives.
- Network activities are described in generic terms. Summer schools and conferences are mentioned but no further information is provided.
- The quality of the proposed interaction between participating organisations is not convincingly addressed since these interactions are highlighted just for some partners and not for the network as a whole. The roles of some partners, for example, partners x and x are not clearly and sufficiently addressed in the proposal.
- Although the areas of expertise involved are clear, the proposal does not provide sufficient detail as to the proposed interactions that will take place.
- The contribution of each participating organisation in the planned activities, and consequently the mechanisms for interaction, are not sufficiently detailed.

## 3. Impact

### 3.1 Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the staff members

- There is a clear ambition for the project to enhance the career perspectives of the involved individuals but limited quality details are provided on this respect. Although information about the involvement in previous programmes of staff exchange is given for some of the partners, the potential in terms of career advancement is not convincingly explained.
- The details of the career development plans are vague and the potential for broadening the career prospects of individuals is not sufficiently convincing.
- The ways by which the project will contribute concretely to skills development are not sufficiently explained. The new knowledge and skills to be acquired and their impact on improved career prospects are not convincingly addressed. In particular, the capacity of the project to strengthen the scientific maturity and potential of researchers is not convincing given because of the limited involvement of non-academic partners and the limited multidisciplinary approach.
- The role of the ERs in the project and influence of the project on their professional development are not described, as the most of the activities and considerations to improve career prospects concentrate on ESR level researchers.
- The description of career development is too generic.
- The perspectives for the future career of the staff members are not clearly outlined except that the additional capacity acquired in the project will make them more competitive in the job market.
- No clear evidence is presented on how experienced researchers will enhance their future career perspectives.
- There is no clear evidence on how project partners will enhance the potential and future career perspectives of the involved researchers since the partners' expertise is not presented in sufficient detail. There are no additional plans regarding the development career perspectives. The new theoretic and experimental skills that might be acquired during the project are limited and insufficiently described.

### **3.2 Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels**

- The description of the development of new and lasting collaborations is not sufficiently described and self-sustainability is only seen in the mentioning of new ideas for next proposals.
- The self-sustainability of the network in post-funding period is discussed too briefly.
- The development of lasting research collaborations and the self-sustainability of the partnership after the end of the action are not sufficiently demonstrated in the proposal.
- The enhancement of the research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is not convincingly demonstrated.
- Contributions to the improvement of innovation potential at the European level have not been presented in sufficient detail.
- The demonstration of expected impact and innovation potential at the European and global scale is limited.
- There is no clear specification of what kind of contribution the proposed project will have to improving the research and innovation potential at the European and global level or that the proposed basic activities will successfully lead to their enhancement.
- The project does not show sufficient secondments in the EU and this limitation does not allow a significant contribution to improving research and innovation at European and global levels.
- The proposal fails to clearly specify the existing links between the beneficiaries, thus, the added value in terms of strengthening or developing new and lasting collaborations is not clear.
- There is insufficient detail of how to practically achieve self-sustainability after the end of the project.
- It is unclear how the expected new and lasting research collaborations will be realised. The ways in which the project will do that are not convincingly addressed. The proposal does not explain in sufficient detail whether and how collaborations, especially the intersectoral one, will continue after its end.

### **3.3 Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results**

- Commercial exploitation routes by the consortium's companies are not sufficiently specified.
- The proposed measures to effectively disseminate the project results are not soundly developed.
- The plan for the exploitation of the results is inadequate.
- The dissemination concept does not express in sufficient depth the quantitative publication goals and considered scientific journals to allow for the efficient monitoring of the dissemination activities.
- Dissemination measures are overly optimistic, publication targets are unrealistic and the plans for dissemination to and with industry are too general and not clearly focused.
- The dissemination measures are insufficiently detailed. For example, the time line to communicate the results at conferences and other events is not coherent with different aspects of the work package results.
- The measures for the exploitation of IP are too generally described.
- The project lacks sufficient detail about planned measures to exploit results, despite the fact that it claims to have results of immediate relevance. In specific, the ways in which the project will facilitate the involvement of relevant actors (e.g. policy makers) and the use of the results by them is not sufficiently presented.

### **3.4 Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences**

- The communication measures are not provided with quantitative indicators to enable their impact to be reliably assessed.
- Outreach activities are not elaborated sufficiently to demonstrate the consortium's commitment to public engagement.
- The quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences is insufficient.
- The communication plan does not fully identify the respective roles and responsibilities of the participants.
- The communication strategy and outreach plan to engage the public are generic. The effectiveness of the proposed measures is not sufficiently explained.
- The communication and outreach measures are only described in a general way, with a limited amount of information on the anticipated activities, the range of audiences targeted and the channels to be used.
- The proposal lacks concrete information about measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences. Especially the ways in which the project will engage and involve the public and will show the benefits of the research outcomes are insufficiently addressed.

## **4. Quality and efficiency of the implementation**

### **4.1 Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources**

- Some work packages are unfocused, which reduces the effectiveness of the work plan.
- The workflow within and between the work packages is incoherent, increasing the likelihood that the targets will not be achieved.
- There is a limited amount of detail on the coordination of the WPs 1-4, which is not commensurate with the large number of tasks and person hours allocated.
- The proposal provides limited information on the hosting arrangements for secondees.
- The proposal has insufficient detail on the complementarity of the participating organisations with respect to the project actions.
- The links between individual tasks, resources to be committed and deliverables for monitoring the project's progress are not presented in a sufficiently clear way.
- Some major organizational aspects of the project are insufficiently presented, making it difficult assess their quality. For instance, the Gantt chart and the organizational structures presented are very unclear.
- The defined milestones are not sufficiently suitable to effectively gauge the progress of the work against the final objective.
- The resources and timelines considered for a number of individual tasks, within the work plan, are significantly underestimated, jeopardizing to an important extent project feasibility.
- Project management, dissemination and communication activities are not clearly included in the planning. Furthermore, the proposal does not offer adequate information about the effectiveness of planned tasks.

## 4.2 Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management

- The envisaged management structure and procedures are very informal and inadequate for a project of this complexity. e.g. The decision making process in the consortium is unclear.
- The risk assessment is insufficiently described.
- The proposed risk management strategy is inadequate. e.g. the risks which may endanger critical aspects of the work plan, and possible contingency measurements are not sufficiently elaborated in the proposal.
- The project fails to convincingly provide a concrete mechanism for the decision-making.
- The management structure of the consortium is not properly described. Management procedures are not sufficiently presented and explained. Non-academic partners are not represented in the decision-making body of the consortium; they do not enter the Supervisory Board (SB). The composition of the external Advisory Group is not evident. The quality management is not clearly addressed.
- The overall management structures, including management boards and procedures, the involvement of partners in management, the roles of the coordinator and the allocation of responsibilities are not explained in sufficient detail in the proposal.
- Progress and quality monitoring mechanisms are not presented in sufficient detail.
- The management structure and procedures are not discussed in the proposal, although a WP related to these activities is planned. None of the management bodies is mentioned. There is no discussion of the distribution of responsibilities.
- The proposed management structure is not sufficient for a large scale joint research project. Only the financial management by the \*\*\*\*\* node is mentioned in the proposal, and no further information about the organisation of the exchange and workshop programs is given.

## 4.3 Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure)

- The hosting arrangements have not been adequately dealt with.
- The hosting arrangements have only been vaguely mentioned.
- The institutional environment and hosting arrangements are not clearly presented for some participants.
- Information regarding the infrastructure of two academic (\*\*\*\*\* and \*\*\*\*\*) and two non-academic (\*\*\*\*\* and \*\*\*\*\*) partners is missing (although a brief description for \*\*\*\*\* and for the non-academic partners is provided in Section 3.4).
- The institutional environment of non-academic partners is not described for 2 of 3 such partners.
- The hosting arrangements are not sufficiently described to provide an acceptable degree of confidence for the successful implementation of the project.
- The existence of the necessary infrastructures in the participating institutions to support the implementation of the project and the hosting of researchers is not adequately specified.
- The infrastructure of the participating institutions and the appropriateness of the hosting arrangements have not been described in sufficient detail. In particular, the hosting arrangements and facilities offered for every ESRs to be seconded to EU beneficiaries and TC partner organizations are not adequately articulated.

#### 4.4 Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the action

- Complementarity between partners is not well highlighted. e.g. many share expertise in the same topics, covering almost all aspects of the project in a single location.
- The level of experience of some participants is not sufficiently documented in the proposal.
- Institutional environment of the participants is not sufficiently described. Judging by the provided information, the institutional environment of one participant (\*\*\*\*\*) is not adequate for the proposed work.
- The expertise and experience in the area of collaboration are not sufficiently documented for some participants.
- The project do not fully demonstrates complementarity and synergy between participants.
- The infrastructure of some participants is insufficiently described.
- The commitment of non-academic participants to the project is not specified in details.
- The role of the participating non-academic organisations, their competences, expertise, and complementarity are only vaguely presented. Crucial information, expected from the Part A, the Tables B4 and B5, is incomplete and even partially completely missing. Therefore, the benefit of the secondments to those participating organisations is doubtful.
- The Table B5 (part B2) is missing for all non-academic partners. Their involvement in innovation activities cannot be evaluated and the complementarity and competence of the innovation staff and institutional environment of non-academic partners lacks sufficient details.