Text inserted by NCP is in **red** throughout the document. Text is intended to provide guidance only, and is not exhaustive.

**START PAGE**

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions

**Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)**

**Call:** **H2020-MSCA-RISE-2016**

PART B

“PROPOSAL ACRONYM”

**Table of Contents**

According to the page limit rules there is no space for a proper Table of Contents, unless you reduce sections 1 to 3 to 29 pages. Our best advice is not to include a ToC.

In drafting PART B of the proposal, applicants must follow the structure outlined below.

**DOCUMENT 1 *(MAX 31 PAGES)***
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**START page count (max 30 pages SECTIONS 1-3)**

**1. EXCELLENCE (*starting page 2*)**
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**4. REFERENCES**

**5. Capacities of the participating ORGANISATIONS**

**6. ETHICS ASPECTS**

**7. Letters of commitment oF partner organisations**

**END PAGE (*1 page*)**

**Please note that:**

* Applicants must ensure that document 1 does not exceed the total page limit of 31 pages (1 start page + 30 pages for section 1-3).
* *No reference to the outcome of previous evaluations of this or any similar proposal should be included in the text. The expert evaluators will be strictly instructed to disregard any such references*

 **START page count – MAX 30 pages**

The **minimum font size** allowed for the main text is **11** points. The page size is A4, and all **margins** (top, bottom, left, right) should be at least **15 mm** (not including any footers or headers). Ensure that the font chosen is clearly readable (e.g. Arial or Times New Roman). As an indication, such a layout should lead to a maximum of between 5,000 and 6,000 possible characters per page (including spaces).

For the **tables**, the font size chosen must be clearly legible by the expert evaluators. The minimum font size is therefore **8 points**. All **footnotes will count towards the page limit.**

**1. Excellence**

Please note that the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers promoting open recruitment and attractive working conditions are recommended to be endorsed and applied by all the funded participants in the MSCA.

**1.1 Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Specific objectives and the relevance of the research and innovation project to the scope of the call and in relation to the "state of art".*
* Start with a short paragraph summarising the overall RISE programme, such as:

*“The overarching objective of this RISE programme is to form an international and inter-sectoral network of organisations working on a joint research programme in the fields of X and Y. The participants will exchange skills and knowledge which will allow them to progress towards key advances in Z, and strengthen collaborative research between in different countries and sectors. Advances in Z will have potential market opportunities for non-academic participants in the project / have significant benefit for European society. The staff members who participate in the project will develop new skills, be exposed to new research environments and have their career perspectives widened”*

* Outline the key specific research objectives of the programme (use a bulleted list, text box or table to make them stand out)
* Describe how the objectives relate to the “scope of the call”
	+ Why do you need to work together on this research?
	+ How will the project “foster a shared culture of research and innovation”?
* Describe the state of the art and how the objectives relate to it
* Include a list of bibliographic references (Section 4)
	+ Make sure to cite consortium members (“you are the experts”)
* *Methodological approach highlighting the types of research and innovation activities proposed and their originality.*
* Break down the research programme into discrete
Work Packages
	+ Insert the provided WP Table B12 at the start of this sub-section:
	+ 3-4 WPs is typical. Give a brief WP summary (one paragraph each) here – precise details go in Section 3.1

**Table B1: Work Package (WP) List[[1]](#footnote-1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Work Package No** | **Work Package Title** | **Activity Type (e.g. Research, Training, Management, Communication, Dissemination…)** | **Number of person-months involved** | **Start Month** | **End month** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Methodology: describe in detail how the objectives in the research programme will be explored
	+ Equipment, techniques, assays, types of research etc.
	+ Lack of clarity around methodology often identified as a “weakness” in unsuccessful proposals. The evaluators need to understand precisely **how** you will carry out the research work, in order to a) determine if the methodology is appropriate and b) what level of novelty is there.
* *Inter/multidisciplinary types of knowledge involved, if applicable.*
* Clearly specify any inter- and multi-disciplinary aspects both in the consortium and in the type of research to be performed
* Evaluators are instructed to value inter/multidisciplinarity highly
* *Gender aspects (both at the level of secondments and that of decision-making within the project).*
* Describe any gender aspects in relation to performing the research – adds value
	+ This toolkit can help you identify gendered innovation <http://www.yellowwindow.be/genderinresearch/downloads/YW2009_GenderToolKit_Module1.pdf>
* Explain the gender balance in the secondment programme and at decision-making level in the project

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The innovative aspects of the proposed research are insufficiently articulated.
* The innovative nature of the project has not been explained thoroughly enough as the proposed research has not been fully linked to the state of art in the field.
* The level of novelty of the proposed methodology is relatively limited.
* The research method does not provide a clear explanation of the interaction between the different work packages, lacking of focus due to the large number of heterogeneous tasks and the significant dispersion of resources.

**1.2 Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives**

Please develop your proposal according to the following line:

* *Approach and methodology used for knowledge sharing (secondments, workshops/trainings/conferences, etc.).*
* Spell out the knowledge-sharing objectives w.r.t. the research objectives, i.e. what knowledge will you share with each other and how will these help you achieve the research objectives?
* Detail the Secondments which will take place
	+ How will they contribute to the knowledge-sharing objectives?
	+ Identify the knowledge provider and the recipient of the knowledge
	+ Specify what knowledge will be transferred during each secondment
	+ How will secondees transfer knowledge whilst on secondment, and how will they embed that knowledge into their home organisation when they return?
	+ Tip: Make sure both ESRs (pre-doc) and ERs are doing secondments (longer visits for ESRs, >4 months are preferred by evaluators)
	+ “A picture tells a thousand words” – use a diagram to show the flow of people around the consortium
	+ Could include a table of the type shown below to summarise all the information:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Researcher Number and Type** | **From[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **To[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Duration [months]** | **Timing [Mx – My]** | **Purpose** | **Transfer Mechanism[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Reintegration Mechanism[[5]](#footnote-5)** |
| 1 – ESR |  |  |  |  |  | Research work | Return to PhD programme |
| 2 – ER |  |  |  |  |  | Research work | Seminar open to Department |
| 3 – MNG |  |  |  |  |  | Attending Workshop | Delivering workshop in sending organisation |
| 4 – TECH |  |  |  |  |  | Demonstration of equipment | Return to role in sending organisation |
| 5 - ESR |  |  |  |  |  | Research work | Workshop for research group |

* Describe the events that will be organised to share knowledge e.g. workshops, meetings, trainings
* Outline the benefits of the knowledge-sharing to the organisations

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The knowledge sharing strategy is not fully convincing:
* The participants’ interactions are not sufficiently emphasized in terms of content and expertise provided to reach the project’s objectives.
* The inter-sectoral dimension of the proposed networking activities is limited.
* The contribution of each participant in the planned activities is not properly outlined.
* There is an over-emphasis on exchanged ERs giving lectures, and on research tasks as opposed to transfer of knowledge objectives.
* The knowledge sharing among the participants is not sufficiently described, and does not provide enough detail regarding the specific activities to be developed by each secondment.
* The goals of the annual workshops are not sufficiently described in terms of networking and knowledge transfer.
* Limited information is provided on how the knowledge will be spread between the partners, since it does not explain the methodology used for knowledge sharing and the presentation of interactions is confusing and not sufficiently consistent.

**1.3 Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Contribution of each participant in the activities planned, including the participants' interactions in terms of content and expertise provided to reach the project’s objectives.*
* Clearly state what each partner will contribute towards achieving the research and knowledge transfer objectives – use a table for brevity and clarity
* Include their expertise, their contribution to networking events, and their level of participation in the secondments
* *Justification of the main networking activities.*
* Justify how the networking events described in 1.2 will contribute to the knowledge-sharing objectives – explain **why** you have chosen these particular activities
* Outline the benefits of the knowledge-sharing to the participating organisations

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The justification of the networking activities lacks detail including specific actions and planning.
* The quality of interaction between the participating organizations is poorly addressed; (for instance: the justification of networking activities and the contributions in terms of content and expertise are not convincing).
* The quality of the interaction between the partners is not well presented in light of the scope of the project. Also, considering that the research programme involves several EU and one TC and both academic and industrial partners, the contribution for each participant is not sufficiently presented.

**2. Impact**

**2.1 Enhancing the potential and future career perspectives of the staff members**

Please develop your proposal according to the following line:

* *The project contribution to realising the potential of individuals and to providing new skills and career perspectives.*
* **Overall aim is to show an understanding of how participating in the RISE project will help the Staff to enhance their potential and improve their career prospects**
* Present an analysis of how participating will affect the Staff, e.g.:
	+ New knowledge gained (e.g. research skills, transferable skills)
	+ Mobility to non-academic sector and/or organisations outside Europe
	(i.e. experiencing different research environments)
	+ Improved understanding of benefits of international and/or cross-sectoral research
	+ Opening their eyes to new career options, particularly outside academia
	+ Raising their profile through networking, research outputs and communication activities to different target groups (including the media & general public)
* Make a tangible link between your programme’s elements and EU policies about research careers/employability – our **research policy brief document** has the details of which points in each policy are relevant to RISE. Sample EU policies include:
	+ Innovation Union
	+ Agenda for New Skills and Jobs
	+ Youth on the Move
	+ Mobility of Researchers between Academia and Industry: 12 Practical Recommendations
	+ “Charter and Code”

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The human resources development potential is described generically, without clear planning.
* At 1 month long, ESR secondments are deemed too short to create an impact in terms of providing new skills and career perspectives.
* It has not been convincingly described how the project will contribute to realising the potential of practitioners with new skills and career perspectives.
* The new career perspectives are not appropriately addressed, without a clear indication of what new opportunities in the job market will be result from this work.

**2.2 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**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Development of new and lasting research collaborations resulting from the intersectoral and/or international secondments and the networking activities implemented.*
* Explain how the secondments and networking events and the **transfer of knowledge** achieved via those mechanisms will help to develop a lasting collaboration between the participants
* Relate to EU policies on international and inter-sectoral collaboration in Research & Innovation - use the **research policy brief** for this. Sample EU policies include:
	+ Mobility of Researchers between Academia and Industry: 12 Practical Recommendations
	+ Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: a strategic approach
* *Self-sustainability of the partnership after the end of the project.*
* What are your plans for building the collaboration and continuing it after the RISE project has ended?
* *Contribution of the project to the improvement of the research and innovation potential within Europe and/or worldwide.*
* Explain how the research programme will contribute to Europe’s economy and/or society
* Link to EU research/policy goals e.g. Horizon 2020 Societal Challenges or Key Enabling Technologies, Research Roadmaps, EU policies on e.g. health, immigrants, digital economy,….,…. all available online (Google it!)
* Link to EU policies on international collaboration such as “Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: a strategic approach”

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The proposal does not demonstrate the potential for the extension of long term collaborations beyond the existing ones.
* The impact of the project on improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is weakly justified in the proposal, or is limited by too narrow a focus and lacks a more translational focus.
* It is evident that some partners have been made to fit into the project but with a weak connection.
* As most of the partners have already participated in previous collaborations, the added value of the research, in the sense of the knowledge sharing, is not clearly articulated.
* ESR secondments are deemed short to create an impact in terms of knowledge transfer (<4 mths in duration).
* The lack of an industrial partner limits the potential impact on innovation in the academic environment.
* The establishment of new and additional collaborations beyond the already existing one is unclear, and is not supported by a comprehensive strategy that can adequately support the organizations to achieve it.

**2.3 Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Dissemination strategy - targeted at scientists, potential users and to the wider research and innovation community - to achieve the potential impact of the project.*
* **Target audience: Other researchers, potential users and the wider research and innovation community**
* Describe how you will ensure that this audience learns about the research activities e.g. publications (provide details of target journals), conferences (provide details of typical/target conferences), workshops, project website, other dissemination activities.
* *Expected impact of the proposed measures.*
* Describe the impact of learning about the research activities on the audience
* Include quantifiable targets for measuring the impact of Dissemination Activities e.g. number of attendees at an event.
* *Intellectual property rights aspects (if applicable) and exploitation of results.*
1. How are the research results useful to business?
	* Outline plans to exploit any IP/commercial potential arising from the programme
	* How have you decided to “allocate” IP in your consortium? Rules simplified at <https://www.iprhelpdesk.eu/FS_IP_management_in_MSCA-H2020>
	* What is the potential **impact** of exploiting commercial potential/IP?
2. How are the research results useful to the wider society?
	* If applicable, how will you ensure that relevant societal actors (community, voluntary sector etc. etc.) will benefit from your project?
	* What’s the potential **impact** of societal exploitation of the results?
* Include quantifiable targets for measuring the impact of IP/exploitation.

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The proposed measures for dissemination are not described in a sufficient manner.
* Dissemination activities are listed but the proposal lacks a clear dissemination strategy.

**2.4 Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Communication strategy, outreach plan and the activities envisaged to engage the public.*
* **In MSCA, Communication = media communications**
* **In MSCA Outreach/Public Engagement = communication with the general public** (who may or may not have an interest in your research area)
* **Communications:**
	+ Describe how you will ensure media coverage about the activities of the programme
* **Outreach/Public Engagement:**
	+ Describe what activities the consortium will undertake to engage the general public about the activities of the project
	+ Plan a range of activities (social media, specific events) targeted at multiple audiences
	+ Need to take place across the whole consortium, not just in Ireland!
	+ Talk to experts at your institution. See what local/national activities you can join in e.g. Pint of Science, SFI Discover
* *Expected impact of the proposed measures.*
* What is the potential impact of media coverage about the activities?
* What is the potential impact of engaging the public in the activities of the RISE?
* Include quantifiable targets for measuring the impact of communications & outreach/public engagement

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The communication strategy and the planned outreach activities envisaged to engage the public and enhance the impact of the proposed measures have not been elaborated in sufficient detail.
* The communication within scientific society and general public including school students is not quantitatively described and not supported by verifiable metrics.
* The plans for public engagement are not specific to the research project and the feasibility of accessing local and national media is not explained in enough detail.

The following sections of the European Charter for Researchers refer specifically to outreach and dissemination:

**Public engagement**

Researchers should ensure that their research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public’s understanding of science. Direct engagement with the public will help researchers to better understand public interest in priorities for science and technology and also the public’s concerns.

**Dissemination, exploitation of results**

All researchers should ensure, in compliance with their contractual arrangements, that the results of their research are disseminated and exploited, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, if appropriate, commercialised. Senior researchers, in particular, are expected to take a lead in ensuring that research is fruitful and that results are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises.

**3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation**

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

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Consistency and adequacy of the work plan and the activities proposed to reach the project objectives.*
* *Credibility and feasibility of the project through the activities proposed.*
* *Gender aspects in the planning of the activities.*
* Write a short opening statement to introduce the work-plan, explaining how:
	+ E.g. it has been devised to allow active planning and management of achieving the project goals, and is based on good practice in managing other projects that you have been involved in.
	+ Explain how gender balance has been taken into account in the planning of the activities (gender of secondees, attendees at networking events etc.)
* Use the Tables provided to describe the Work Packages (WPs)
	+ 3 -4 Research WPs (typically)
	+ Management WP
	+ Transfer of Knowledge WP (i.e. secondments and networking events)
	+ Dissemination/Exploitation/Communication/Public Engagement WP
* Provide a Gantt Chart to illustrate timelines. Templates available at <http://www.hyperion.ie/templates.htm> . Ensure the project is **well-timed.**

**Table B2: Work Package Description**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Work Package Number** |  | **Start Month – End Month** |
| **Work Package Title** | (e.g. Research, Training, transfer of knowledge Management, Communication, Dissemination, etc.) |
| **Lead Beneficiary**  |  |
| **Participant Short Name** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Person-months per Participant:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Objectives** |
| **Description of Work and Role of Specific Beneficiaries / Partner Organisations**(possibly broken down into tasks), indicating lead participant and role of other participants*Description of Work: Break down each WP into several Tasks (3-6 is typical)**Task 1**Task 2**Task 3**Role: Use org short names from Participants Table to indicate which org(s) are responsible for each Task e.g. DCU, DLI**Indicate timescales for the Tasks (in months elapsed from the start of the project) e.g. M6, M12**Ensure everything matches the details given elsewhere in the application (esp. the Gantt chart)* |
| **Description of Deliverables**(brief description and month of delivery) |

The participant short name and person-months allocated to each participant should be coherent with the Part A of the proposal.

**Table B3.a: Deliverables List**

A **deliverable** is a **distinct output of the project, meaningful in terms of the project’s overall objectives and constituted by a report, a document, a technical diagram, a software, training, conference, etc.** The number of deliverables in a given Work Package must be **reasonable** and commensurate with the Work Package content and the associated secondments. It should be kept in mind that the secondments encoded in part A are already key deliverables in all RISE projects but they do not need to be encoded in this deliverables list. The additional deliverables below should be divided into scientific deliverables and management, training exploitation and dissemination deliverables.

Scientific deliverables have technical/scientific content specific to the project. Avoid duplication of reports and keep in mind that the grant will impose a yearly reporting to the consortium. Note that during implementation, the submission of these deliverables to the REA will be a contractual obligation.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Scientific Deliverables*** |
| **Deliverable Number[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Deliverable Title** | **WP No.** | **Lead Beneficiary Short Name** | **Type[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Dissemination Level[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Due Date[[9]](#footnote-9)** |
| Use the convention Dx.y where x is the Work Package number and y is the deliverable number, e.g. D1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Management, Training, and Dissemination Deliverables*** |
| **Deliverable Number** | **Deliverable Title** | **WP No.** | **Lead Beneficiary Short Name** | **Type** | **Dissemination Level** | **Due Date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table B3.b: Milestones List**

**Milestones** are control points in the project that help to chart progress. Milestones may correspond to the completion of a key deliverable, allowing the next phase of the work to begin. They may also be needed at intermediary points so that, if problems have arisen, corrective measures can be taken. A milestone may be a critical decision point in the project where, for example, the consortium must decide which of several technologies to adopt for further development.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Title** | **Related Work Package(s)** | **Lead Beneficiary** | **Due Date** | **Means of Verification[[10]](#footnote-10)** |
| Use the convention Mx.y where x is the Work Package number and y is the deliverable number, e.g. M1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The role of every partner in each work package is not evident.
* The work packages and task leaders (persons in charge) are not clearly specified.
* Milestones are not considered in detail.
* The distribution of the secondments (person-months) is unbalanced with some partners assigned a high number of secondments without convincing justification.
* The mechanisms for the monitoring of the progress of the project are not sufficiently developed, and they do not address the milestones of the project. The number and timeliness of the deliverables are not sufficiently discussed.
* The work plan lacks some details concerning methodology (e.g. how the primary data will be collected).
* The reason for the non-academic partner to only receive secondments, but not make secondments is not sufficiently explained.
* The quality management is not supported by verifiable metrics, and the measures for risk management do not address specific research potential problems.
* The monitoring of the project progress is not supported by adequate milestones.
* Some secondments are not sufficiently justified in terms of duration or activities.
* The list of deliverables does not include tangible outputs, beyond minutes, plans, reports and data.

**3.2 Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Project organisation and management structure, including the financial management strategy, as well as the progress monitoring mechanisms put in place.*

**Aim: explain who is responsible for what and how they have the skills/expertise to do it well:**

* Describe your management structure (use a diagram to show links and reporting lines)
	+ Outline the role of the Coordinator
	+ Make sure all participants are involved in decision making - typical to have an overall Management Committee/Supervisory Board where all participants are members and which endorses the main decisions and planning
	+ Can have sub-committees for e.g. research, secondments & events, communications etc.
	+ All committees should be gender-balanced
	+ Specify how frequent the meetings will be

The tasks which should be carried out by the management structure include (list not exhaustive):

* Financial management. Describe which institutional departments will help with managing the programme (Finance, HR etc.) and what their experience is e.g. number of FP7/Marie Curie/H2020 projects managed (NB for the Coordinator)
* Monitoring progress and **quality** – e.g. frequency of reports from the participants to the management, frequency of interaction between the Staff members and the lead researcher in the organisation
* Internal communications strategy (between the participants), including, for example, any online mechanisms for knowledge-sharing and keeping in touch
* Gender aspects in decision making
* How IPR will be managed and who in the institution will help with managing it – tech transfer office or similar.
* *Risks that might endanger reaching the project’s objectives and the contingency plans to be put in place should risk occur.*
* Complete the table provided with research and project management risks

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk No** | **Description of Risk** | **WP Number** | **Proposed mitigation measures** |
| R1 | e.g. delay in planned secondments | WP1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The management structures and procedures are not sufficiently detailed. In particular, the measures to achieve efficient management communication are not adequately specified.
* The decision making mechanism and conflict resolution schemes are insufficiently detailed.
* The periodic reports are scheduled for only once per year, which is limited for the scale and duration of the project.
* Arrangements for practical support for the detached and incoming staff are not sufficiently considered.
* The risk management and contingency plans lack detail or are missing. Personal, technical risks and associated contingency actions are not adequately identified. IPR issues are not properly addressed. Please note: It is not realistic to classify all the risks associated with the project as low risk.
* The quality management issues are not adequately addressed. For example, the Management board is described and it is described how it intends to mediate in case of conflicts, but it is not discussed in sufficient detail how it intends to monitor the quality of the project in practice.
* The involvement of the participants in managing and monitoring of the project is not adequately described, and processes for overall evaluation of progress are not sufficiently addressed. Responsibilities lie largely with the coordinator, without devolvement of duties to work package leaders, which is not appropriate for a consortium of this size.
* The management procedures are described in inadequate detail, e.g. the frequency of meetings of the board is not specified.

**3.3 Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure)**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

* *Availability of the expertise and human resources, to carry out the proposed research project.*
* *Description of the necessary infrastructures and any major items of technical equipment (if required) relevant to the proposed project.*

**Aim is to explain who is doing what, and do they have the necessary infrastructure to do it?**

* Section 5 will include a Capacities Table for each participant.
* This section should complement Sec. 5 not duplicate it.
* Describe how the participants have the necessary expertise and human resources to carry out the proposed project (including secondments).
* Describe how the consortium has the necessary infrastructure (research and administrative) to implement all aspects of the programme (research, organising events, admin, communications, exploitation etc.).
* Describe how the participants provide an excellent environment for hosting and supporting the Staff who visit them such as help with finding accommodation, with immigration and other practical matters, including:
	+ Affirming that the EURAXESS Service Centres will assist with mobility issues. There are >200 service centres in 40 countries. See <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/index>. All Irish HEIs are EURAXESS Local Contact Points and have a designated person (list at <http://www.euraxess.ie/academic/page.aspx?SP=Contact>) who can help visiting researchers.
	+ Have the organisations endorsed the Charter & Code – if yes, say so! List at <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/rights/charterAndCode>
	+ Have the organisations earned the “HR Excellence in Research” logo? If yes, say so and **include the logo in the Capacities Table**! List at <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/rights/strategy4ResearcherOrgs>

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The appropriateness of the institutional infrastructure has been insufficiently addressed.
* The infrastructures of some non-academic participants are only briefly described. Some necessary equipment is not fully described.

**3.4 Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the project**

Please develop your proposal according to the following lines:

*Adequacy of the partnership to carry out the project explaining how participants' synergies and complementarities will be exploited.*

*NB: The individual members of the consortium are described in Section 6. There is no need to repeat that information in this section*

* Explain how the consortium are the best people to implement this programme including:
	+ Complementarities/synergies in expertise between all participants and how this complementarity allows them to successfully deliver the programme (use a diagram or table)
	+ How their previous experience makes them suitable for their tasks here
* Outline the commitment of each participant by showing that they are all highly active in the project – refer to earlier sections – use a table
* For TC participants, refer to contents of Letters of Commitment from each TC participant – **proposal text must match the Letter**.
* Particularly important for high-income TC contributing their own budget – they should make a financial commitment in the letter

**Common Weaknesses in unfunded RISE applications:**

* The partnership brings complementary expertise to the project, however it is not sufficiently clear how the resulting synergies are to be exploited.
* Competences and experiences of the non-academic partner have not been specified in sufficient detail.
* The complementarity of the different partners is not sufficiently detailed

**STOP page count – MAX 30 pages**

1. A work package is defined as a major subdivision of the proposed project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Insert short name of sending organisation [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Insert short name of hosting organisation [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Suggested examples – not exhaustive [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Suggested examples – not exhaustive [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates. Please use the numbering convention <WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>. For example, deliverable 4.2 would be the second deliverable from Work Package 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

**R** = Document, report (excluding periodic and final reports); **ADM** = Administrative (ethics/legal/administrative related outputs); **PDE** = dissemination and/or exploitation of project results (website completion, patents filing, conference, etc.); **OTHER** = Other including coordination [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

**PU = Public:** fully open, e.g. web; **CO = Confidential:** restricted to consortium, other designated entities (as appropriate) and Commission services;

**CI = Classified:** classified information as intended in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Measured in months from the project start date (month 1). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Show how the consortium will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype completed and running; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)