

MSCA-DN EVALUATIONS

Professor M. Inés Torres, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Bilbao, Spain

MSCA-DN EVALUATIONS

- Three evaluators (one *rapporteur*), one Vice-Chair, Chair, Ethics Experts, Independent Observer.....
- Individual Evaluation Report (IER) Phase
- Consensus Report (CR) Phase
- Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) Phase

Excellence 50%

1. Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art).
2. Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices).
3. Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host
4. Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's professional experience, competences and skills.

Excellence

1. Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)
.....*and whether the research and innovation objectives are realistically achievable, measurable and verifiable (KPI)*
2. Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects **if relevant** for the research project, and the quality of open science practices).....*Technical Robustness of Artificial Intelligence*
3. Quality and credibility of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral and gender as well as other diversity aspects). Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

Impact (30%)

1. Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development.
2. Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.
3. The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts.

Impact (30%)

1. Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability *(inside or outside of academia)* of researchers and contribution to their skills development.
2. Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.....*Target groups (dissemination and exploitation)objectives, messages, engagement, tools, channels (communication).* **IP mangement (if relevant)**
3. The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts.**results of the project** *beyond the immediate scope and duration of the proposal*.....magnitude importance credibility as outlined in the proposal

Implementation (20%)

1. Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages.
2. Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements.

Implementation (20%)

1. Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages. (Deliverables, milestones,*GANTT: tasks, milestones, secondments, visits to industry, training...*)
2. Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements.*(integration in teams, support services, infrastructures, logistics, facilities,)*

SOME TIPS

- Excelencia, innovación y COHERENCIA,. La propuesta es una historia.
- Consecuentes con la disciplina y características de la investigación, etc.
- Destacar palabras clave aquí y allá: innovación, género,.....
- Especificar...contestar a las preguntas que se hacen a los evaluadores.
-not sufficiently clear...not specific enough....not convincingly demonstrate....
- Echar un vistazo al Handbook.....
- **Se evalúa la propuesta,** no al proponente, no al supervisor.....