



15 DICIEMBRE

UN CAFÉ. CON LOS NCPS

11:30

Hablemos de la nueva
convocatoria
MSCA COFUND 2021

TEMAS A TRATAR EN NUESTRA PROPUESTA COFUND

- % CO-FINANCIACIÓN
- PLANTEAMIENTO CORRECTO DEL PRESUPUESTO
- CONFIGURACIÓN DE NUESTRO PROYECTO
 - ASSOCIATED PARTNERS
 - IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS
- CARTAS DE COMPROMISO
- PROYECTOS CON ALGUNAS RESTRICCIONES
- PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN DE LOS CANDIDATOS/AS
- DEBILIDADES EN EXCELENCIA – PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN
- DEBILIDADES EN IMPACTO

PRESUPUESTO

- Mínimo 3 investigadores/as contratadas.
- Siempre PM bajo contrato de empleo

3 - Budget

Participant number	Organisation short name	Role	Country	Academic sector	IO	No of recruited researchers	Number of person months(Employment)	Number of person months(Fellowship)
1	MADRIMASD	Coordinator	ES	No	No	0	0	0
Total						0	0	0

PRESUPUESTO

- Mínimo 3 investigadores/as contratadas.
- Máximo 36 meses de contrato posdocs, tiempo necesarios para obtener el doctorado para predocs.
- Siempre PM bajo contrato de empleo

3 - Budget

Participant number	Organisation short name	Role	Country	Academic sector	IO	No of recruited researchers	Number of person months(Employment)
1	MADRIMASD	Coordinator	ES	No	No	30	1080
Total						30	1080

PRESUPUESTO

- Mínimo 3 investigadores/as contratadas.
- Siempre PM bajo contrato de empleo

3 - Budget

Participant number	Organisation short name	Role	Country	Academic sector	IO	No of recruited researchers	Number of person months(Employment)
1	MADRIMASD	Coordinator	ES	No	No	30	1080
Total						30	1080

PRESUPUESTO

- Calculo automático N^o PM * 2.800 € de Contribución UE
- Tenemos dos Categorías por parte del beneficiario
 - Own Resources y Financial Contributions

No of recruited researchers	Number of person months(Employment)	Number of person months(Fellowship)	Contributions for recruited researchers		Total EU Contributions	Own resources	Financial contributions	Total estimated project income [?]
			Employment Contract	Fixed amount fellowship				
30	1080	0	3024000	0	3024000.00			3024000.00
30	1080	0	3024000	0	3024000.00	0.00	0.00	3024000.00

PRESUPUESTO

- OWN Resources: aportación económica que aporta el beneficiario. Independientemente si son fondos propios o fondos regionales, nacionales, etc
- Financial Contributions: aportaciones de los socios.

No of recruited researchers	Number of person months(Employment)	Number of person months(Fellowship)	Contributions for recruited researchers		Total EU Contributions	Own resources	Financial contributions	Total estimated project income [?]
			Employment Contract	Fixed amount fellowship				
30	1080	0	3024000	0	3024000.00	2500000.00	500000.00	6024000.00
30	1080	0	3024000	0	3024000.00	2500000.00	500000.00	6024000.00

PRESUPUESTO

- Parte B1
- Coherencia entre los diferentes presupuestos Parte A, Parte B1 y Parte B2 (aportaciones de los AP – IP)

Cost categories	EU contribution (EUR/person-month)	Total cost = EU contribution + own resources (EUR/person-month)
COFUND allowance	2 800 (for <u>Doctoral</u> *) 3 980 (for <u>Postdoctoral</u> *)	***
Mobility allowance**	N/A	***
Family allowance**	N/A	
Travel allowance**	N/A	
Research costs**	N/A	
Other (training, etc.) **	N/A	
Management costs **	N/A	
Indirect costs**	N/A	
Number of fellows		
Number of fellow months		
Total amount		

PRESUPUESTO

Consideraciones en las Financial Contributions

- ¿Quiénes pueden aportar esta categoría?
 - Associated Partners
 - Implementing Partners
- **Coherencia con las cartas de compromiso**
 - Novedad en la aportación financiera
 - Implementing Partners no aparecen en Form A. No olvidar hacer referencia a la contratación de fellows en la carta de compromiso.
 - Associated Partners si aparecen en el Forma A, pero no se completa nada en su presupuesto.
 - Será un punto donde los evaluadores pongan mucha atención.

▲ 6.1. Template of Commitment letter for implementing/associated partners

- On headed paper of the entity

- Beyond any additional information that the participating organisation wishes to indicate in its Letter of commitment, the following text should appear in all its parts and with no modifications:

I undersigned⁷, in my quality of⁸, commit to set up all necessary provisions to participate as associated partner (or implementing partner) in the proposal submitted within the call HORIZON-MSCA-COFUND-2021, should the proposal be funded.

On behalf of [name of the entity], I also confirm that we will participate and contribute to the research training programme (Doctoral or Postdoctoral) as planned. In particular, our [name of the entity] will be involved in[Free field for any additional information that the participating organisation wishes to indicate in order to describe its role and contribution to the project, if a financial contribution is expected then specify the amount].

I hereby declare that I am entitled to commit into this process the entity I represent.

CARTAS DE COMPROMISO

Consideraciones sobre las cartas de compromiso

- ¿Seguimos el modelo planteado?
 - SI
 - NO
- Referencia a la Evaluación de las Cartas
- In case the letter does not follow the template or fail to give enough information on the associated partner's role and/or enough assurance on their commitment in the project (e.g. no signature, wrong proposal references, outdated letter...), the experts may penalise the proposal on these aspects under the implementation evaluation criterion.
- Discutamos sobre este aspectos. ¿Qué opináis?
- AP obligatoria

▲ 6.1. Template of Commitment letter for implementing/associated partners

- On headed paper of the entity

- Beyond any additional information that the participating organisation wishes to indicate in its Letter of commitment, the following text should appear in all its parts and with no modifications:

I undersigned?, in my quality of?, commit to set up all necessary provisions to participate as associated partner (or implementing partner) in the proposal submitted within the call HORIZON-MSCA-COFUND-2021, should the proposal be funded.

On behalf of [name of the entity], I also confirm that we will participate and contribute to the research training programme (Doctoral or Postdoctoral) as planned. In particular, our [name of the entity] will be involved in[Free field for any additional information that the participating organisation wishes to indicate in order to describe its role and contribution to the project, if a financial contribution is expected then specify the amount].

I hereby declare that I am entitled to commit into this process the entity I represent.

PRESUPUESTO: % DE CO-FINANCIACIÓN

- No hay ninguna referencia al % de co-financiación de las propuestas MSCA COFUND 2021.
- Aportación única por parte de la UE.

Dudas:

- Own resources corresponde solamente al Coordinador beneficiarios o también a los aportes de los socios?
- ¿Cual es la distribución óptima entre categorías?
- ¿Tenemos categorías comodín?
- ¿Debemos ir al 50%, o mejor al 60-40% o incluso a un 70-30%?

Cost categories	EU contribution (EUR/person-month)	Total cost = EU contribution + own resources (EUR/person-month)
COFUND allowance	2 800 (for <u>Doctoral</u> *) 3 980 (for <u>Postdoctoral</u> *)	***
Mobility allowance**	N/A	***
Family allowance**	N/A	
Travel allowance**	N/A	
Research costs**	N/A	
Other (training, etc.) **	N/A	
Management costs **	N/A	
Indirect costs**	N/A	
Number of fellows		
Number of fellow months		
Total amount		

INFORMACIÓN SOBRE ASSOCIATED – IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

Seguir las indicaciones de la plantilla.

- No limite de paginas para la sección 4 – 6
- Para la sección 5
- Completar la tabla 5 no olvidar la contribución financiera de los AP o IP.
- Media pagina por AP o IP
- Tamaño mínimo de fuente **9!!!!**
- Debemos duplicar la información de los Associated Partners que ya incluimos en la parte A?

Table 5.1

Partner organisation name	Partner organisation short name	Country	Implementing Partner (tick)	Associated Partner (tick)	Academic (Y/N)	Role			
						Hosting researchers WITH recruiting (Y/N)	Hosting researchers WITHOUT recruiting (Y/N)	Providing other training or career development opportunities (Y/N)	Financial contribution in EUR (if applicable)

For Associated partners (if applicable one per associated partner):

Associated Partner Legal Name:		Country:
General description		
Key Persons and Expertise (including supervisors)		
Key Research Facilities, Infrastructure and Equipment		
Previous and Current Involvement in Research and Training Programmes		

For Implementing partners (if applicable one per implementing partner):

Implementing Partner Legal Name:		Country:
General description		
Key Persons and Expertise (including supervisors)		
Key Research Facilities, Infrastructure and Equipment		
Previous and Current Involvement in Research and Training Programmes		

PROYECTOS CON RESTRICCIONES

¿Podemos acotar / restringir nuestro proyecto COFUND? SI / NO ???

¿Qué tipo de

- Restricción por edad / por experiencia
- Restricción por área científica
- Restricción por género

Argumentos:

- 1
- 2

DEBILIDADES PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN - P F

- The **one stage evaluation** process, assessed by **two evaluators without interviews** held and **without consensus** meetings presented, lowers its overall transparency.
- The formulation of the **redress procedure lacks** sufficient clarity.
- **No redress procedure** seems to be in place.
- The proposal does not convincingly demonstrate the substantial **involvement of international experts** in the interview panels as required by the MSCA COFUND rules.
- **Transparency of international peer review** in the selection of candidates is **not well demonstrated**.
- An open call is foreseen in order to attract international experts. However, there is **lack of clarity** regarding **mechanisms to ensure the international composition of peer reviewers** dedicated to the evaluation.
- The external and international aspects of the selection process are not convincingly presented. Proposal lacks clarity to what extent external (non-beneficiary) **experts will participate in the peer-review and the interview**.
- There is a **lack of significant involvement of international experts in the interview panels** which does not meet adequately with the international peer review requirement of the COFUND programme.

DEBILIDADES PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN - P F

- Some aspects of the selection process lack sufficient transparency. In particular, it is **not well demonstrated** that the **evaluation will be entirely bias-free**, and is unclear whether the HR personnel handling the appeals will possess adequate knowledge about the organisation of scientific peer review.
- The proposal does not provide enough justifications for the **considerable time spent on the eligibility check, online interviews and appeal phases** as well as on the proposed complexity of the selection workflow (at the submission level).
- **How the interviews will be standardized** is not sufficiently described, particularly what mechanism will be used to ensure fairness and equality and how interviews will be weighted.
- The **role of international experts** in the interview panel is **limited to that of observers** at the interview phase, which conflicts with impartial and transparent procedures.
- A **video-conference interview** with the applicant is foreseen for the highest ranked applicants, however criteria for **judging merit** in this interview are not clearly stated.
- The **recruitment process is outsourced to a third-party organisation** which can help to make the selection workflow neutral and transparent. However, there is **not enough information** provided about the actual workflow or role of different actors within that organisation to give a clear picture of the recruitment process.

DEBILIDADES EN EL IMPACTO - P F

- It is not explained which **part of dissemination** is dedicated to create impact on regional, national or international level.
- Evidence of **action plans to invest in and strengthen human resources on the regional**, national and international level remains unclear.
- It is **not concretely explained how a benefit for regional, national and international** level would follow or would contribute to regional and/or European socio-economic development.
- **Potential and future career prospects** are presented with **limited concrete examples of employability** in academic and non-academic fields. There is insufficient mention of the programme-specific research areas and the connected professional/vocational fields.
- The impact on **enhancing the fellows' careers in the non-academic sector is too limited**, as it is mainly provided by options for secondments

DEBILIDADES EN EL IMPACTO - PF

- The **Key Performance Indicators** for impact measures after the programme are **not fully developed**.
- The description of **Open Access is insufficiently addressed**. There is insufficient specification of open data and FAIR data repository provision. The **Data Management plan is insufficiently** proposed at the project level.
- Limited information is provided in relation to the **procedure/key performance indicators to monitor the impact** and effectiveness of the **proposed communication measures**.
- The **planned communication is only marginally described** and does not go much beyond some of the dissemination activities (such as social media) and only vaguely identifies target audiences.
- The IPR issues, especially the **regulations with the partner organisations, and the exploitation strategy are not addressed** in sufficient detail.
- The **exploitation mechanisms are not sufficiently described** in the proposal.