



MSCA and CITIZENS Handbook 2025

NETWORK OF THE NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS FOR THE MARIE SKŁODOWSKA-CURIE
ACTIONS (MSCA)

Task 3.1	Handbooks and Submission Guides
Issued by:	DLR (DE)
Issued date:	23 July 2025
Work Package Leader:	RANNIS (IS)



Funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of contents

Abbreviations	1
Disclaimer	2
Acknowledgements	2
How to use the Handbook	2
MSCA and Citizens essentials	3
Key tips for proposal template and layout	6
(Standard application form HE MSCA CITIZENS)	6
Definitions and key aspects	8
1. Excellence	12
2. Impact	17
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation	25

Abbreviations

AC –Horizon Europe Associated Country
 EC – European Commission
 ESR –Evaluation Summary Report
 FAQ – Frequently asked questions
 GfA – Guide for Applicants
 HE – Horizon Europe
 MS – Member States
 MSCA – Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions
 NCP – National Contact Point
 PIC - Participant Identification Code
 REA – European Research Executive Agency

Disclaimer

This Handbook is an UNOFFICIAL document prepared by RADIANCE, the EU-funded project of National Contact Points (NCP) for the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA). It is the continuation of the MSCA Handbooks prepared within the MSCA-NET project by the Croatian Agency for Mobility and EU Programmes.

The information contained in this document is intended to assist and support, unofficially and practically, anyone submitting a proposal to the MSCA and Citizens call with the deadline of 22 October 2025. This document is not, by any means, a substitute for official documents published by the European Commission, which in all cases must be considered binding. As such, this document is to be used in addition to the official call documents: MSCA Work Programme 2023-2025, and the Guide for Applicants for MSCA and Citizens 2025, prepared by the European Research Executive Agency (REA).

This document may not be considered in any way as deriving from and/or representing the views and policies of the European Commission (EC) and the REA. Likewise, it may not be considered as a document deriving from and/or representing the views and policies of the entities that are beneficiaries of the RADIANCE project.

For the purpose of the Handbook, Version 2.0 of the MSCA Citizens proposal template is used (published on 03. April 2025). It is the responsibility of the applicant to remain aware of any updates and to use the latest version of the official call documents should they be published after the publication of this document.

Please note that this document is susceptible to data corruption, unauthorized amendment, and interception by unauthorized third parties for which we accept no liability.

This Handbook may not be reproduced or sections thereof re-used without explicit permission from the author, German Aerospace Center (DLR).

Acknowledgements

We thank our NCPs colleagues and RADIANCE project task members from Croatia, Iceland and Türkiye, external Experts/ Scientists who acted as Evaluators for their valuable insights, as well as the EC / REA Staff, for valuable feedback.

How to use the Handbook

This Handbook should be used in conjunction with the **MSCA Work Programme 2023 – 2025, Guide for Applicants**, and proposal templates, and **Standard application form (HE CSA MSCA CITIZENS)**, downloaded from the call webpage on the **Funding & Tender Opportunities Portal**. Please note that the information in this Handbook complements the information contained in the template for Part B of the proposal.

- Information from the original Part B proposal is written in black Calibri font.
- Additional suggestions & information for each section of the proposal are written in blue.
- Tables with the top strengths and weaknesses of each sub-criterion illustrate comments by evaluators in previous Evaluation Summary Reports.

MSCA and Citizens essentials

Before you begin preparing your proposal, please ensure you are aware of the following facts and comply with the requested requirements:

MSCA Citizens DEADLINE

- **22 October 2025, 17:00 Brussels time**
- You can submit your application at any time before the deadline. Once submitted you can reopen, edit and resubmit your proposal as many times as required before the call deadline. Only the last submitted version of the proposal will be evaluated. Please start early!

CONSORTIUM REQUIREMENTS

- **Countries:** only legal entities established in EU Member States (MS) or Horizon Europe Associated Countries (AC) can be beneficiaries. Also International European research organisations are eligible for funding.
- **Organisation:** the MSCA and Citizen's activities can be organised by one beneficiary or by several organisations constituting a partnership.
- Beneficiaries are signatories of the Grant Agreement and contribute directly to the implementation of the action
- In case there is more than one beneficiary, one of them assumes the role of the coordinator.
- Activities in non-associated third countries are not eligible for funding

RESUBMISSION

- For the MSCA and Citizens calls there is no resubmission restriction.
- If you intend to re-submit a proposal, you must indicate re-submission in Part A of the project proposal, including the reference number of the previously submitted proposal.
- For resubmissions, don't only focus on the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) from the previous submission. Review the proposal as a whole to find room for improvement. Your new proposal is not being evaluated in comparison with the old one. Evaluators will have access to the previous ESR after they have evaluated the new proposal.
- Part B might change slightly from one year to another (e.g., subheadings), so please be sure that you are using the template of the 2025 MSCA Citizens call.

Upon fulfilling requirements for this call, make sure you have also prepared the following:

GENDER EQUALITY PLAN

- Having a gender equality plan is an eligibility criterion for public bodies, higher education establishments and research organisations from Member States and Associated Countries. Once a project proposal is selected, consortium partners concerned by this eligibility criterion will have until the Grant Agreement signature to confirm they have a Gender Equality Plan (GEP) in place.

REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED DOCUMENTS

- Read the required and recommended documents that contain the rules and conditions for the call:
 - [MSCA and Citizens Guide for Applicants 2025](#)
 - [MSCA Work Programme 2023 – 2025](#)
 - [Proposal template and instructions on how to fill it in](#)
 - [Flyer MSCA & citizens 205 all you need to know](#)
 - [MSCA & Citizens call: 6 steps to prepare your application](#)
 - [RADIANCE Q&A Blog](#)

RADIANCE Policy Briefs

- The Policy Briefs originally produced as part of the former NCP network project “MSCA-NET” (2022-2025) continue to serve as valuable resources under the current RADIANCE project. These briefs are designed to provide a short, but comprehensive overview of the European policy objectives and how these feed into shaping Horizon Europe. They aim to help researchers and organisations better understand the policy objectives in the context of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions.
- Available Policy Briefs are:
 - [Open Science](#)
 - [Missions in HE](#)
 - [Gender](#)
 - [Green Deal](#)
 - [Synergies](#)
 - [Supervision](#)
 - [Charter for Researchers](#)
 - [Widening](#)
 - [Artificial Intelligence](#)
 - [Ethics](#)

FAMILIARISE YOURSELF WITH THE SUBMISSION PROCESS

- Proposals must be created and submitted on the [Funding & Tender Opportunities Portal](#) by a contact person of the coordinating organisation – using the coordinator’s Participant Identification Code (PIC) number.
- Proposal templates (Part B) can be downloaded once the submission has been started and a proposal profile is created on the Funding & Tender Opportunities Portal.
- For more details on the submission process, you can consult the [Proposal Submission Service User Manual](#) and the [RADIANCE Submission Guide](#).

**UNDERSTAND
WHAT IS
REQUIRED
FOR THE
SUBMISSION**

- **Administrative forms (Part A)**
Part A constitutes an integral part of your proposal; it is the part of the proposal where you will be asked for certain administrative details that will be used in the evaluation and further processing of your proposal.
 - **Narrative Part B**
 - **Part B**, containing a maximum of 33 A4 pages
 - **Table of contents should be 1 page long**
 - The remaining 32 pages must contain the list of participants and sections 1, 2 and 3, All tables, figures, references and any other element pertaining to these sections must be included as an integral part of these sections and are thus counted against this page limit.
 - The number of pages included in each section of this template is only indicative.
 - Any excess pages (i.e., numerical page 34 and beyond) will not be made available to the evaluators (automatically blanked out) and therefore will not be taken into account.
 - The proposal is a self-contained document. Experts will be instructed to ignore hyperlinks to information that is specifically designed to expand the proposal, thus circumventing the page limit.
 - Must be uploaded as a PDF
 - **Part B Annex**
 - In this detailed excel budget table applicants will have to present a detailed estimation of the costs of the lump sum project and calculate the lump sum breakdown per beneficiary and work package in the following categories:
 - Personnel costs
 - Subcontracting costs
 - Purchase costs
 - Other costs
- More information on lump sums can be found here:
- https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/lump-sum-funding-what-do-i-need-to-know_en.pdf
- <https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/other/event250327.htm>

**NCP
SUPPORT**

- MSCA National Contact Points (NCP) support applicants by providing guidance on the MSCA application process and implementation.
- You can contact your NCP via [Find your NCP MSCA | Horizon Europe NCP Portal](#)

Key tips for proposal template and layout

(Standard application form HE MSCA CITIZENS)

The following information is important to familiarise yourself with as it will make the review process for the evaluators easier.

1. General points and information on Part A

- **Acronym:** Use a self-explanatory title and a memorable acronym. Don't forget that you will not be able to change the acronym once you submit your proposal on the Funding and Tenders Portal. The acronym will be on your proposal, and you will refer to it throughout your communication and dissemination activities. Ensure that the acronym is short, easy to pronounce, and easy to remember by the evaluators. Please also be careful that it cannot be construed as inappropriate or have a "double meaning" in another language. Here is a useful tool for creating an acronym: <http://acronymcreator.net/>
- Check http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/home_en.html to see if an EU project with the same acronym already exists. An internet search could also be used to determine if the acronym is "protected".
- Free keywords (Enter any words you might think give an extra detail of the scope of your proposal (max. 200 characters with spaces))
- A description on how to select the keywords is available in a [specific FAQ](#).

2. Abstract

- The abstract is a short description of your project (maximum 2000 characters including spaces).
- The abstract should clearly and briefly present your project's main goals, its innovative approach, and how it engages citizens with science. It must highlight the expected societal impact and outline how you will communicate and disseminate the results to increase public awareness and interest in research.
- The abstract in Part A should not contain sensitive information, as it will be made publicly available if the project is funded.
- See examples of existing projects in CORDIS (using filters [Projects – Horizon Europe – Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions](#))
- To get in touch with organisations that already conducted a MSCA and citizens project or are planning to submit an application you can also use the [RADIANCE MSCA Matchmaking Platform](#)

3. Additional ethics information

- If you entered one or more ethical issue/s in the ethical issues table in Part A of the proposal, then you must also submit an ethics self-assessment field in Part A. More information is available in **How to complete your ethics self-assessment guide**.
- More information on ethics issues in Horizon Europe is available in:
 - **REGULATION (EU) 2021/695** - articles 18. and 19.
 - **Work Programme 2023-2025 – General Annexes** – Ethics part starts on page 14.
- More information on ethics is also available in **HE Programme guide** (from page 23)

4. Proposal layout

- The page size is **A4**, and all **margins** (top, bottom, left, right) should be at least **15 mm** (not including any footers or headers).
- All tables, figures, references and any other element about these sections must be included as an integral part of these sections and they are counted towards this page limit.
- The reference font for the body text of proposals is **Times New Roman** (Windows platforms), **Times/Times New Roman** (Apple platforms) **or Nimbus Roman No. 9 L** (Linux distributions).
- The use of a different font for the body text is not advised and is subject to the cumulative conditions that the font is legible and that its use does not significantly shorten the representation of the proposal in several pages compared to using the reference font (for example to bypass the page limit).
- **The minimum font size allowed is 11 points.** This applies to the body text, including text in tables. Text elements other than the body text, such as headers, foot/end notes, captions, formula's, may deviate, but must be legible.

5. Proposal template

- Use the proposal template provided, including the exact sub-headings, because:
 - It matches the evaluation template and helps you to put the right information in the right place for the evaluators to find it.
 - Evaluators use a “checklist” approach to marking – make it easy for them to find the relevant information!
 - The proposal acronym must be placed in a header on each page in addition to already placed information: Call: - HORIZON-MSCA-2025-CITIZENS-01-01: European Researchers' Night and Researchers at Schools 2026-2027 depending on what your proposal covers
 - All pages should be numbered in a single series on the footer of the page to prevent errors during handling. It is recommended to apply the following numbering format: “Part B – Page X of Y”.

6. Page limitations

- Part B: The title, list of participants and sections 1, 2 and 3 together **must should be longer than 33 pages**.
- After the deadline, excess pages (in over-long proposals) will be automatically blanked, and therefore will not be taken into consideration by the evaluators.

7. Proposal language

- The proposal should be written in English.
- Explain any abbreviations the first time you use them.
- Use simple clear text to be sure that it reads well.
- Avoid long sentences. Avoid too much repetition. Sign-post or cross reference to other parts of the proposal if necessary.
- Do not copy & paste information from other documents/websites. Instead, tailor information to fit your proposal.

Definitions and key aspects

DISCLAIMER: For the purpose of this MSCA Citizen Handbook, authors may interpret official EU definitions that are stated in the official Citizen call documents. Any interpretation by the authors will be indicated in blue font.


DEFINITIONS	
Critical risk	<p>A critical risk is a plausible event or issue that could have a high adverse impact on the ability of the project to achieve its objectives.</p> <p>Level of likelihood to occur (Low/medium/high): The likelihood is the estimated probability that the risk will materialise even after taking account of the mitigating measures put in place.</p> <p>Level of severity (Low/medium/high): The relative seriousness of the risk and the significance of its effect.</p>
Deliverable	<p>A report that is sent to the Commission or Agency providing information to ensure effective monitoring of the project. There are different types of deliverables (e.g. a report on specific activities or results, data management plans, ethics or security requirements).</p>
Impacts	<p>Wider long term effects on society (including the environment), the economy and science, enabled by the outcomes of R&I investments (long term). It refers to the specific</p>

	<p>contribution of the project to the work programme expected impacts described in the destination. Impacts generally occur some time after the end of the project.</p> <p><i>Example: The deployment of the advanced forecasting system enables each airport to increase maximum passenger capacity by 15% and passenger average throughput by 10%, leading to a 28% reduction in infrastructure expansion costs.</i></p>
Milestone	<p>Control points in the project that help to chart progress. Milestones may correspond to the achievement of a key result, 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. The achievement of a milestone should be verifiable.</p>
Objectives	<p>The goals of the work performed within the project, in terms of its research and innovation content. This will be translated into the project's results. These may range from tackling specific research questions, demonstrating the feasibility of an innovation, sharing knowledge among stakeholders on specific issues. The nature of the objectives will depend on the type of action, and the scope of the topic.</p>
Outcomes	<p>The expected effects, over the medium term, of projects supported under a given topic. The results of a project should contribute to these outcomes, fostered in particular by the dissemination and exploitation measures. This may include the uptake, diffusion, deployment, and/or use of the project's results by direct target groups. Outcomes generally occur shortly after the end of the project.</p> <p><i>Example: 9 European airports adopt the advanced forecasting system demonstrated during the project.</i></p>
Pathway to impact	<p>Logical steps towards the achievement of the expected impacts of the project over time, in particular beyond the duration of a project. A pathway begins with the projects' results, to their dissemination, exploitation and communication, contributing to the expected outcomes in the work programme topic, and ultimately to the wider scientific, economic and societal impacts of the work programme destination.</p>
Research output	<p>Results generated by the action to which access can be given in the form of scientific publications, data or other engineered outcomes and processes such as software, algorithms, protocols and electronic notebooks.</p>
Results	<p>What is generated during the project implementation. This may include, for example, know-how, innovative solutions, algorithms, proof of feasibility, new business models, policy recommendations, guidelines, prototypes, demonstrators, databases and datasets, trained researchers, new infrastructures, networks, etc. Most project results (inventions, scientific works, etc.) are 'Intellectual Property', which may, if appropriate, be protected by formal Intellectual Property Rights.</p> <p><i>Example: Successful large-scale demonstrator: trial with 3 airports of an advanced forecasting system for proactive airport passenger flow management.</i></p>
Technology Readiness Level	<p>See Work Programme General Annexes B</p>


ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS and KEY ASPECTS from the EC that can be useful while preparing your MSCA and Citizens project proposal

<p>Guidance on the use of generative AI tools for the preparation of the proposal</p>	<p>Applicants should provide information on any use of generative AI tools for the preparation of the proposal. -</p> <p>AI definitions are available in the <u>Definition from the European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence</u>.</p> <p>See also <u>Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research and recommendation for researchers, research organisations and funding organisations</u>.</p> <p>When considering the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools for the preparation of the proposal, it is imperative to exercise caution and careful consideration. The AI-generated content should be thoroughly reviewed and validated by the applicants to ensure its appropriateness and accuracy, as well as its compliance with intellectual property regulations. Applicants are fully responsible for the content of the proposal (even those parts produced by the AI tool) and must be transparent in disclosing which AI tools were used and how they were utilized.</p> <p>Specifically, applicants are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify the accuracy, validity, and appropriateness of the content and any citations generated by the AI tool and correct any errors or inconsistencies. • <i>Provide a list of sources used to generate content and citations, including those generated by the AI tool. Double-check citations to ensure they are accurate and properly referenced.</i> <p>Be conscious of the potential for plagiarism where the AI tool may have reproduced substantial text from other sources. Check the original sources to be sure you are not plagiarizing someone else's work. Acknowledge the limitations of the AI tool in the proposal preparation, including the potential for bias, errors, and gaps in knowledge.</p>
<p>Associated Partners</p>	<p>Associated Partners are entities which participate in the action but without the right to directly charge costs or claim contributions. They contribute to the implementation</p>
<p>Grant Agreement</p>	<p>The Grant Agreement is the legal instrument that provides for EU funding of a successful proposal. The following link outlines the process: <u>Grant Agreement preparation procedure</u> and takes precedence over any agreement that may be reached among members of the consortium.</p>
<p>MSCA Green Charter</p>	<p>The <u>MSCA Green Charter</u> is a code of good practice for individuals and institutions that receive MSCA funding. It promotes the sustainable implementation of research activities. The goal of the Green Charter is to encourage sustainable</p>

	<p>thinking in research management. This document can give you some ideas while writing your project proposal.</p> <p>The European Commission has also produced a set of <u>guidance material</u> together with the MSCA Green Charter, which can give you ideas on this subject.</p>
Horizon Europe Missions	<p>EU missions are commitments to solve some of the greatest challenges facing our world like fighting cancer, adapting to climate change, protecting our oceans, living in greener cities and ensuring soil health and food. They are an integral part of Horizon Europe. Each mission will operate as a portfolio of actions – such as research projects, policy measures or even legislative initiatives - to achieve a measurable goal that could not be achieved through individual actions. EU missions will contribute to the goals of the European Green Deal, Europe's Beating Cancer Plan as well as the Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <p>Areas where there are missions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cancer • Adaptation to climate change including societal transformation • Healthy oceans, seas coastal and inland waters • Climate-neutral and smart cities • Soil health and food <p>Reference documents and further reading:</p> <p>https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-europe/eu-missions-horizon-europe_en</p>

 *Fill in the title of your proposal below.*

TITLE OF THE PROPOSAL

 *The consortium members are listed in part A of the proposal (application forms). A summary list should also be provided in the table below.*

[This document is tagged. Do not delete the tags; they are needed for processing.] #APP-FORM-HECSA@#

List of participants [e.g. 1 page]

Participant No. *	Participant organisation name	Country
1 (Coordinator)		
2		
3		

* Please use the same participant numbering and name as that used in the administrative proposal forms.

1. Excellence #@REL-EVA-RE@#

Excellence – aspects to be taken into account.

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives
- Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures including soundness of methodology.

⚠ *The following aspects will be taken into account only to the extent that the proposed work is within the scope of the work programme topic*

- Write a short introductory paragraph with an overview of the project.
- Emphasise the motivation for the project and what challenges you want to tackle. Choose a motto of your project that will be a base for your key messages.
- Don't write too technically, but make the evaluator curious.
- Embed your project in the bigger context of European research and societal priorities.

1.1 Objectives #@PRJ-OBJ-PO@# [e.g. 1 pages]

- Briefly describe the objectives of your proposed work. Why are they pertinent to the work programme topic? Are they measurable and verifiable? Are they realistically achievable?

#\$PRJ-OBJ-PO\$#

- Clear and precise definition of the objectives: the objectives should be clearly and unambiguously stated to immediately convey what the project aims to achieve.
- Relevance to the Work Programme: The objectives must directly address the topic and priorities of the work programme and a specific call, demonstrating how they meet its specific requirements and the aims of the MSCA and Citizens Call:
 - to bring research and researchers closer to the public at large
 - to increase awareness of research and innovation activities
 - to boost public recognition of science and research education
 - to promote gender balance and inclusiveness in science, Open Science, and Responsible Research and Innovation.
 - to strengthen the connection between research and education. It brings school classes to research facilities and researchers to schools or other pedagogical and educational centres
- Describe the objectives detailed for each category of target audience.
- Measurability and verifiability: Each objective should be linked to clear, quantifiable indicators that allow for objective measurement and verification of progress and success.
- Realistic and achievable objectives: The objectives should be ambitious yet feasible,

showing that the planned activities can be completed within the project's timeframe and available resources.

- Coherence among objectives: Short-, medium-, and long-term objectives should be logically connected and build upon each other to ensure a coherent project structure.
- Alignment with societal challenges and EU Policies: The objectives should reference relevant EU missions, priorities (e.g., climate change, digital transformation, gender equality), and societal challenges to emphasize political and societal relevance. EU connection can also be achieved with the representation of multiple EU funding programmes.
- Inclusion of Diversity and Gender Balance: The objectives should incorporate strategies to ensure the involvement of diverse target groups, especially those underrepresented or disadvantaged.
- Explanation of how the objectives will be achieved and measured: A description should be provided on how progress towards objectives will be monitored and evaluated (e.g., KPIs, surveys, evaluations) to ensure transparency and accountability.
- One objective should be to highlight what impact European research has on people's everyday life.
- Also including a young target group is considered advantageous.

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The project pertinently responds to all the main objectives of the CITIZENS work programme and includes important topics such as inclusion and diversity. The objectives are clear.
- The proposal effectively provides explicit and credible information on the targets and the means of measurement for each objective, supporting their achievability and measurability.
- The objectives are highly relevant, ambitious, clear, and in line with the EU Missions in the fields of adapting to climate change and restoring our oceans and waters. They clearly demonstrate how the project will bring researchers closer to the public and show the role of research in society and the economy.
- The proposal features convincing aims and objectives focused on bringing publics and researchers together, showing the role of researchers for society and addressing the general public, especially youth.
- The main objective aligns perfectly with the scope of the MSCA and Citizens ("CITIZENS") call, it is clearly elaborated in short- medium- and long-term goals, outcomes and impacts, and it considers appropriate measures to achieve them successfully.
- The project objectives are very well-defined, measurable, verifiable, and attainable, covering a wide range of topics, including promoting and demystifying science, thereby encouraging scientific careers. It also emphasizes inclusiveness in research in terms of gender balance, diversity and inclusion of people with disabilities. Gender balance and inclusiveness in science are effectively integrated in the project by showcasing activities such as the Awards for Women in Science and "Girl's Day".
- The objectives align well with the Call, especially when it comes to breaking down negative perceptions of researchers and emphasizing EU approaches to global challenges.
- The overall aim of engaging with public audiences and promoting the societal benefits of research while encouraging interest in research careers is highly pertinent to the MSCA work programme and the CITIZENS call.
- Objectives are fully in line with the Work Programme and EU missions, offering a highly relevant and interesting advances in several topics, such as Farm to Fork, Biodiversity, Circular economy, Zero pollution, toxic-free environments, Health & Wellbeing, Energy and resource efficient buildings, Clean, affordable & secure energy, Sustainable and Smart mobility. Specific objectives are clearly set, realistic, and achievable through excellently chosen types and well-planned activities.


WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The project concentrates on deep tech jobs, technology adoption, and entrepreneurial activities but does not sufficiently address the CITIZENS call's objective of bringing research and researchers closer to the public. As a result, it only partly meets the goal of showcasing the role of researchers in society and making research more accessible to the general public.
- The objectives of the project are generic and lack sufficient information about how these objectives will be achievable, measurable and verifiable.
- The promotion of gender balance, diversity, and inclusiveness in science is insufficiently addressed, for example, engaging with audiences who do not have easy access to research activities.
- Key performance indicators to make the objectives concrete, measurable, and achievable are not sufficiently specified.
- The proposed activities for the European Researchers' Night are not well aligned with the objectives of the call. The activities are not sufficiently designed for the general public and for students, but for professional groups, such as policy makers, researchers, NGOs and industrial representatives.
- The objectives are divided into generic and specific, however they are not sufficiently streamlined and the project description does not provide a clear connection between the two different categories of objectives.
- The proposal fails to fully demonstrate how the focus on fundamental physics allows it to address all aspects of interdisciplinary challenges linked with the European Commission priorities, such as EU Missions or the Green Deal.

1.2 Coordination and/or support measures and methodology #@CON-MET-CM@# #@COM-PL-CP@# [e.g. 6 pages]

- Describe the main ideas on which the proposal relies;
 - Clearly present the interdisciplinary nature of your project.
 - Emphasize how various scientific disciplines (e.g. Biology, Engineering, Medicine, Mathematics, Humanities) are integrated into the concept and how this diversity will help make science more accessible and engaging to a broad audience.
 - Highlight your commitment to inclusion and diversity: Explain the specific measures you will take to reach underrepresented and disadvantaged groups, including people with disabilities, individuals in remote or closed environments, and socially marginalized communities.
 - Explain how your topics align with EU Missions and societal challenges, describe how the themes you've selected (e.g. climate change, health, biodiversity, social inequality) are directly linked to the EU's priorities and how your project will illustrate the societal relevance and impact of research.
- Indicate the topics considered, the various disciplines involved;
 - Demonstrate the interdisciplinary approach by showing how various fields (such as Biology, Physics, Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts) will work together in your activities to make research engaging and accessible.
 - Illustrate how researchers' expertise will be showcased: clearly describe how participating researchers from different disciplines will present their work through interactive methods

- (e.g., hands-on experiments, live demos, citizen science) that reflect the diversity of science and its applications in everyday life.
- Ensure representation from both STEM and non-STEM disciplines: try to include contributions from the humanities, arts, and social sciences to foster holistic conversations between researchers and the public. This helps make the event relatable to diverse audiences.
- Clearly list and explain the scientific topics covered: Ensure that the key themes (e.g. such as climate change, health and wellbeing, biodiversity, digital transformation, or circular economy) are clearly identified and linked to societal challenges and EU Missions.
- Describe the stakeholders (local/regional/national authorities, funding agencies, companies, etc.) and their engagement;
 - Specify local, regional, and national authorities, funding agencies, research institutions, companies, NGOs, schools, and other key partners involved in the project.
 - Inform how stakeholders will support the project, whether through funding, outreach, providing venues, expertise, or promotional activities, and how they contribute to achieving the project objectives.
 - Show how engaging diverse stakeholders will increase the project's visibility, ensure broad dissemination, facilitate access to target audiences, and create sustainable partnerships beyond the project's lifetime.
 - Highlight plans for involving stakeholders actively throughout the project, such as regular coordination meetings, joint events, co-creation of activities, and feedback mechanisms to ensure their commitment and collaboration.
 - Emphasize how current collaborations or established networks with stakeholders will be leveraged to enhance project implementation, foster synergies, and ensure efficient coordination across different regions and sectors.
 - If applicable, highlight experience, lessons learned from previous projects (it doesn't have to be a Night project, it can be any other EU/national project focusing on a promotion of science). Also, focus on a beneficiary's expertise.
- Describe and explain the overall methodology, including the concepts, models and assumptions that underpin your work. Explain how this will enable you to deliver your project's objectives.

 *This section should be presented as a narrative. The detailed tasks and work packages are described below under 'Implementation'.*

#§CON-MET-CM§# #§COM-PLE-CP§# #§REL-EVA-RE§#

- Explain the key assumptions behind your approach and how they support the feasibility and effectiveness of your planned activities.
- Clearly describe the overall methodology, including the main concepts and models that form the foundation of your project.
- Demonstrate how your methodology is aligned with the project's objectives and will enable you to achieve measurable and verifiable outcomes.
- Show that your methodology includes robust mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment to ensure continuous improvement and success.
- Highlight any innovative or interdisciplinary approaches used and justify why they are appropriate for reaching your target audiences.
- Demonstrate the use of creative and artistic approaches. Make it clear how you, for example, will use arts-based methods (e.g. theater, visual arts, music) to communicate science in an accessible and engaging way, especially when working with schools or young audiences. If needed, include a training on public engagement for the involved researchers

before the activities start.

- Show how your methodology promotes inclusion, diversity, and engagement across different stakeholder groups.
- Plan an attractive programme of events tailored to different target groups and interests. Please provide an overview of the events scheduled for European Researchers' Night, including both the pre- and post-events.
- They should be varied and entertaining e.g.: shows, exhibitions, games, workshops, hands-on experiments, discussions, conferences and workshops.
- Where will the events take place? Any locations people normally do not have access to?
- In case improvements are required, how will the activities between the two editions be optimized?

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- This project methodology involves adaptability and innovation by incorporating diverse disciplines, including maths, biology, engineering, ecology and medical fields.
- The methodology underpinning the project's objectives is both clear and credible, particularly the IPAR (Inclusion, Participatory collaboration, Agile, Reciprocity) method, which is an effective way to engage target groups. Furthermore, the use of artistic and creative approaches to captivate young people adds significant value to the project.
- Overall, the methodology includes mix of suitable diverse approaches including a significant scale of activities across a large geographical area, multiple researchers and different audiences.
- The selected sub-themes and range of disciplines effectively promote benefits of research to society and add up to a consistent and attractive public programme.
- The proposal includes a strong focus on measures to promote gender balance with an aim for a considered ratio of female to male researchers.
- The methodology is clear, comprehensive, and of high quality, bringing researchers from various related disciplines to the general public in an entertaining way.
- The proposal has a very good network of scientists, contacts and potential alliances, at the national and international level. Special attention is paid to relevant stakeholders in the education sectors such as the Ministry of Education, university networks, non-formal education (e.g. NGOs) museums, and research centers, providing synergies and additional support measures to the achievement of the project's goals.
- The proposal offers a comprehensive multidisciplinary approach through the topics embedded in EU missions, involving STEAM fields, and addresses key challenges at regional and European level.
- The proposal promotes diversity and inclusiveness through a very extensive programme, which is addressed to disadvantaged and underrepresented individuals and communities, even including people in hospitals and prisons. The gender balance principles are very clearly explained.
- The proposed decentralized approach including both research institutes and popular venues, such as shopping malls and the annually interchange of the locations effectively increases the likeliness to attract people to the European Researchers' Night events. A well-defined calendar of pre-events, where researchers will engage with diverse target audiences, provides compelling evidence to ensure a wide outreach.
- Some concepts and perspectives are innovative and credibly contribute to the quality of the project, such as the inclusion of non-academia opportunities in promoting research careers.

WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The proposal lacks clear elucidation of the methodologies required to attain its objectives, therefore it is not completely clear that the goals of the project will be successfully achieved.
- The overall concept, which would bind together the whole action and locations, is only vaguely explained and the methodology and support measures are poorly defined. The links between the activities and the research areas of the involved partners are not sufficiently clear.
- The way in which the project will leverage relevant regional networks, initiatives and schemes to provide synergies and support measures is not sufficiently identified.
- It is not suitably demonstrated how exactly the different stakeholders will contribute to the project implementation.
- The methodology for the impact assessment is not sufficiently elaborated. The impact sample is only described in general terms and it is not clear how this sample will be achieved.
- The programmes lack sufficient elaboration, for example, the exact type of specific events in every city lack clarity.
- The activities have a strong focus on schools and addressing a young audience but do not offer sufficient engagement activities for the general public, such as those who do not have easy access to STEAM fields. The programme primarily involves passive events where participants observe demonstrations or listen to lectures. It is unclear how that will encourage participants to put themselves in the researchers' shoes or actively engage in the process of science.
- The roles of the stakeholders in the partnership are not sufficiently specified to maximize both communication and implementation of the project. Furthermore, the suggested methodology is not sufficiently defined about collaborations with other similar activities within the country or beyond.
- The proposal provides the number of people taking part in the activities both live and digitally, however this is not a sufficient assessment to justify the project's effectiveness.
- The Researchers at Schools initiative is not given sufficient consideration as not enough information is provided on what the initiative would entail, how it would be developed, and how teachers would be supported in developing a scientific approach around priority topics.
- Several of the proposed pre-events are disconnected from the main concept (focusing on climate change). This incoherence compromises the overall soundness of the project.
- The specific challenges related to identifying and prioritizing gaps in the existing support structures and mechanisms at partner institutions or stakeholders have not been adequately specified.

2. Impact #@IMP-ACT-IA@#

Impact – aspects to be taken into account.

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions due to the project.
- Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

The results of your project should make a contribution to the expected outcomes set out for the work programme topic over the medium term, and to the wider expected impacts set out in the 'destination' over the longer term.

In this section you should show how your project could contribute to the outcomes and impacts described in the work programme, the likely scale and significance of this contribution, and the measures to maximise these impacts.

2.1 Project's pathways towards impact

- Provide a **narrative** explaining how the project's results are expected to make a difference in terms of impact, beyond the immediate scope and duration of the project. The narrative should include the components below, tailored to your project
 - (a) Briefly describe the specific problems or opportunities that triggered this project, including the needs of specific stakeholders, end-users or citizens.
 - Clearly define the societal problems or gaps the project aims to address, using relevant statistics or evidence (e.g. dropout rates, decrease in interest to become a researcher, mistrust in science, green transition etc.). If you have a national analysis covering social perception of science, it could be a good base to demonstrate an impact of the project.
 - Identify specific target groups and stakeholders such as youth, educators, journalists, or underrepresented communities, and describe their needs.
 - Explain how the project responds to both regional and broader EU-level challenges, demonstrating awareness of context and added value.
 - Describe concrete opportunities such as building on previous events or experiences, and show how these inform and strengthen the new project.
 - Show how EU-funded research is relevant to citizens' daily lives, to justify public engagement and raise awareness.
 - Highlight the project's potential to inspire the next generation of researchers, especially by involving schools, families, and hands-on activities.
 - Demonstrate inclusivity and diversity by addressing multicultural and diverse backgrounds and ensuring broad participation
 - Use a structured and analytical approach to present the link between problems, stakeholders' needs, and proposed activities, ensuring clarity and credibility.
 - (b) Describe the unique contribution your project results would make towards (1) the **expected impacts**, and (2) the **outcomes** as specified in the work programme.
 - ⚠ *Be specific, referring to the effects of your project.*
 - ⚠ *State the target groups that would benefit from the project.*
 - Clearly link your project's activities to the expected impacts and outcomes stated in the MSCA work programme — show how each action directly contributes to these goals. Avoid generic statements.
 - Be specific about your project's unique added value, such as innovative formats, new target groups, or improved outreach methods that go beyond standard approaches.
 - Identify and describe the concrete effects of your project, such as increased science interest among the youth, improved public understanding, or greater researcher visibility.
 - Name your target groups precisely (e.g., primary school students, teachers, journalists,

- families, EU-funded researchers) and explain how each will benefit from your activities.
- Demonstrate how the project addresses both short-term and long-term impacts, including how your results may influence future behaviour, attitudes, or policies.
- Use evidence or experience from past events or pilot phases, if available, to show how your approach has worked and why it will be effective again; this adds credibility.
- Highlight how your project contributes to European priorities, such as inclusiveness, science education, or addressing regional challenges, to show alignment with EU values.
- Include a plan for evaluating impacts and outcomes, using measurable indicators and feedback mechanisms to show how you will track and optimize your contribution over time.

(c) Give an indication of the scale and significance of the project's contribution to the expected outcomes and impacts, should the project be successful. Provide quantified estimates where possible and meaningful.

⚠ *Explain your baselines, benchmarks and assumptions used for those estimates. Wherever possible, quantify your estimation of the effects that you expect from your project. Explain assumptions that you make, referring for example to any relevant studies or statistics.*

⚠ *Your estimates must relate to this project only - the effect of other initiatives should not be taken into account.*

- Provide clear, realistic, and well-justified quantitative estimates (baseline impact assessment) of the expected outcomes and impacts, supported by data, previous experience, or relevant studies. Avoid overly optimistic figures without solid evidence.
- Explain the baseline situation or current status before the project starts, to clearly show the added value and progress your project aims to deliver.
- Use specific, measurable indicators that align directly with the project's activities and the expected impacts specified in the MSCA work programme.
- Justify assumptions made for your estimates, citing relevant statistics, regional data, or evaluation results from previous editions or similar projects.
- Focus on the contribution of your project alone, excluding effects or influences from other initiatives, to maintain clarity and credibility.
- Clearly define the target groups (e.g., students, researchers, general public) and specify the expected scale of their engagement or benefit, with numerical targets where possible.
- Address both short-term and medium-term impacts, showing how your project will contribute meaningfully during and beyond its lifetime.
- Include a credible plan for monitoring and evaluation, explaining how you will collect data and measure progress against your quantitative targets to validate your impact estimates.

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The pathways are credible as there are a range of measures that will achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme. The discussions, science shows, presentations, workshops and hands-on activities raise curiosity and inspire potential young researchers for a research career.
- The scale of the project is very significant compared to the population of the country.
- The proposed pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme are well addressed. Measurable indicators and targets for awareness-raising, participation, engagement, and evaluation are given good consideration.
- The scale and significance of the contributions from the project are very well explained with a detailed evaluation plan using both quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a robust framework for assessing impact effectively.
- The planned activities and targeted outcomes of the project positively contribute to the short-term and long-term societal impacts outlined in the work programme.
- The impacts suggested on all involved and participating organizations are ambitious, strong and very well justified in the proposal including specific activities and actions to promote understanding of the EU. All outputs make clear contributions to realise the expected impacts, particularly in terms of raising awareness of importance and benefits of research and raising interest among young people in research careers.
- The proposal offers strong and credible pathways to achieve the expected outcomes. All the impact elements are well identified, clear and measurable. The proposal estimates the scale and significance of the project's expected outcomes, which are ambitious but achievable and will have a significant impact in [country name].
- The impacts suggested in the proposal have scale, significance and ambition, with very convincingly estimated number of actual visitors and very likely to realise all of the expected impacts in the call.
- Significant scale of involvement and visibility of researchers, including a substantial number of EU-funded researchers, increases potential impact and challenges stereotypes particularly given attention paid to multicultural backgrounds.
- The impact assessment is excellent, robust and extensive, with considered sampling drawing on social science which strengthens the proposal. Use of previous evaluation of the proposed impacts arising from various activities and a robust plan for improvement for 2024 and 2025 will also increase the expected impact.
- Expected impacts and outcomes are accurately approached, allocating a reasonable pathway in line with precisely identified target groups, and giving indications of the expected effects during the project lifetime and envisaging long-term impacts.
- Challenges set out in the proposal are clearly highlighted in regional context, related to the unemployment, school dropouts, or conceptual distance between science and citizens, with reference to relevant statistics. The proposal includes strong demonstration of how EU-funded projects contribute to addressing regional and global challenges, and the impact of R&I on daily life.
- The proposal effectively assesses the project's contribution scale and significance to each expected outcome, providing a well-structured and insightful analysis. Additionally, it outlines thoughtful and adaptable approaches, such as tailoring support measures to different age groups of children.
- The project provides a clear overview of the specific problems or opportunities, tackled by the project, with relevance to the needs of specific stakeholders, end users, citizens, and the region where the project is implemented.

WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- Some of the KPIs in the proposal appear overly optimistic and are not well justified, with the proposal lacking a convincing explanation for their determination and the strategies for their realization.
- There is insufficient identification of the direct link between expected impacts and the Researchers' Night activities themselves.
- The expected quantitative impact of the project is insufficient, and the scale and significance of the project is not adequately defined. The specific target audiences are very generic and not clearly defined, and the impact indicators are not convincingly identified.
- The proposed key impact pathways are not fully credible. They lack sufficiently specific metrics and measurable indicators to assess the project's outcomes.
- It remains unclear how and to which degree the outcomes will be reached through the proposed project.
- Specific outcomes and in particular estimations about the scale and significance of the project contribution are not sufficiently explained.
- The potential impacts and the pathways to achieve them are not sufficiently elaborated. This leaves a significant gap in understanding the lasting influence and the reach of the project's outcomes.
- The proposal does not provide a sufficiently detailed identification of strategies to optimize the anticipated results and effects. For instance, it is not sufficiently shown how researchers' abilities and communication skills would be enhanced to interact with various target groups.
- The proposal states the expected outputs and outcomes without sufficiently elaborating on what specific steps will be taken to reach them. Hence, the significance of the project's contribution to the expected outcomes set out for the work programme is insufficiently justified.

2.2 Measures to maximise impact - Dissemination, exploitation and communication # @COM-DIS-VIS-CDV @

- Describe the planned measures to maximise the impact of your project expected outcomes and impacts, including dissemination and communication activities by providing a first version of your 'plan for the dissemination and exploitation including communication activities' (*The plan consists of the information provided on the 7 points indicated below and that **must be addressed***).
- Estimated overall number of attendees expected in the main NIGHT events.
 - Provide a realistic and evidence-based estimate of total attendees at the main CITIZENS events, supported by data from previous editions or similar events to justify your numbers.
 - Explain the assumptions and factors influencing your estimates, such as venue capacity, marketing reach, regional population size, and past event attendance trends.
 - Break down the expected attendance by key target groups (e.g., students, families, researchers, general public) to show clear understanding of the audience composition and to tailor activities accordingly.
 - Include contingency plans or strategies to increase attendance, such as partnerships, media campaigns, or incentives like free transport to encourage broader participation.
 - Inform about measurable indicators and monitoring tools to track attendance during the events, ensuring your estimates are verifiable and can inform ongoing adjustments to maximize impact.

- Estimated number of pupils to be reached by the activities at schools.
 - Provide clear, data-driven estimates of the number of pupils expected to participate, based on previous school outreach programs, regional school demographics, and planned frequency of activities.
 - Specify the types of schools targeted (e.g., urban, rural, underserved areas) and explain how these choices influence the expected pupil reach, ensuring inclusivity and broad impact.
 - Describe the methods used to engage schools and pupils, such as collaboration with education authorities, tailored communication campaigns, and interactive formats, to justify the feasibility of reaching the estimated numbers.
- Overall number of people likely to be made aware of your events.
 - Provide a well-founded estimate of the total audience reached through all communication channels, including digital media, traditional media, and partner networks.
 - Explain the methodology and assumptions behind your awareness calculations, referencing past campaigns or relevant data when possible.
 - Highlight specific strategies designed to maximize outreach to diverse groups and ensure broad public visibility of the events.
- Describe the involvement of researchers. Involvement of researchers funded by Horizon Europe or previous Framework Programmes, notably by the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions is encouraged.
 - Specify the number and roles of researchers involved in the project, emphasizing those funded by Horizon Europe and previous Framework Programmes.
 - Detail how Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions fellows and alumni will actively participate in events, workshops, or communication activities (in case your institution only has a small number of former or current MSCA fellows, present this as a challenge you will tackle by raising awareness of the MSCA through MSCA NCPs or researchers funded by other EU programs).
 - Explain the benefits of researcher involvement for both the project's impact and the researchers' professional development, including science communication training opportunities.
 - Describe plans to highlight and promote the contributions of EU-funded researchers to enhance the visibility of Horizon Europe's added value.
- If relevant, indicate partnerships and coordination at regional, national or cross-border levels with other initiatives (whether similar or not);
 - Clearly identify existing partnerships and collaborations at regional, national, or cross-border levels that will support the project's implementation and outreach.
 - Explain how coordination with other relevant initiatives will maximize synergies, avoid duplication, and enhance overall impact.
 - Describe concrete mechanisms or plans for communication and cooperation with partner organizations to ensure effective joint activities and knowledge exchange.

- Explain how the European Researchers' Night will be highlighted as a European (and Europe-wide) event and how you will promote the European Union and its impact on citizens' daily life in the most appropriate way, according to the set-up and the configuration of the event, its location and its activities.
 - Clearly describe how the event will emphasize its European dimension by showcasing the diversity and collaboration of researchers from different EU countries, including those funded by Horizon Europe and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions.
 - Outline specific activities and communication tools (e.g., EU-themed info corners, presentations, interactive workshops) designed to raise awareness of the EU's role in funding research and its benefits to citizens' daily lives.
 - Explain how partnerships with European and regional institutions, media, and stakeholders will be leveraged to promote the EU's presence and impact across all event locations and activities.
 - Detail the use of multi-language materials and inclusive communication strategies to reach diverse audiences and strengthen the European identity of the Researchers' Night event.
 - Highlight plans to integrate digital and on-site elements (like online streaming, EU branding, and social media campaigns) to connect local events into a cohesive Europe-wide celebration, maximizing visibility and engagement.
- Describe your dedicated promotion of the Researchers at Schools activities, particularly towards schools and other pedagogical and educational centres
 - Clearly explain the targeted communication channels and outreach strategies tailored specifically for schools, teachers, and educational centres to maximize participation in Researchers at Schools activities.
 - Describe planned collaborations with regional and national educational authorities and networks to facilitate integration of the activities into school curricula and schedules.
 - Highlight innovative and engaging formats such as workshops, competitions, and interactive science shows designed to capture students' interest and encourage active involvement.
 - Detail the support and training offered to participating researchers and educators to ensure high-quality, effective science communication tailored to different age groups and educational needs.

#SCOM-DIS-VIS-CDV\$# #SIMP-ACT-IA\$#

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The project includes realistic estimates for reaching a large audience with awareness material as well as a high number of visitors and participants at activities and events.
- An engaging, innovative, and effective dissemination and communication plan is elaborated with appropriate activities and a varied set of dissemination tools that support communication to a wide audience of different target groups, including researchers and MSCA fellows.
- The consortium has secured important partnerships to ensure efficient coordination at regional, national, and European levels. This provides a network of collaborators for the awareness campaign and a high involvement of relevant communities, which will support the ability to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts.
- The dissemination and communication strategy is very good. The project elaborates a comprehensive campaign to raise awareness of the public engagement events, with a diversity of

channels (media, press, website, social media, etc.) and strong partnerships. The project sets up very ambitious reach targets, yet they are realistic and well substantiated.

- The communication activities are outlined very well. Relevant target audiences such as students, teachers, families, and underserved communities are identified along with suitable communication channels tailored to engage them.
- The promotion of the EU is convincingly addressed thanks to the presentation of EU-funded activities and the EU Blue Growth Career Corner as well as engagement activities focusing on education with entertainment.
- The communication measures include a strong mix of appropriate approaches including preparatory activities, pre-events, tools to reach young people and a general public audience with an integrated sustainable dimension.
- The awareness campaign is very professionally designed and envisages differentiated strategies for each identified target audience, ensuring a large outreach at regional level. The engagement of regional celebrities to support the communication efforts provides additional attractiveness.
- The communication strategy is credible, based on a cross media strategy and addresses different target groups for the activities. It is reinforced taking into consideration planned collaboration and synergies with other initiatives, within the country and beyond. Connections with schools will be well-established through formal institutions at the regional levels, as well as by events preceding the Researchers' Night.
- The communication strategy is sound and clear with a cross-media plan. The methodology used to implement the communication plan is comprehensive as it starts from a strategy that focuses on brand, materials, and channels and identifies target groups. Target groups to be reached by the awareness campaign are appropriately identified and specific actions for each of them are designed to engage them in a specific and effective way.
- The proposal includes well developed and ambitious communication and dissemination plans with key performance indicators, communication channels and clearly identified target audiences.
- The project foresees an attractive digital/interactive EU corner that will contribute to a better understanding of the European Union policies and its programmes.
- The inclusion and planning for the involvement of researchers funded by Horizon Europe and previous Framework Programmes, particularly Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, is well-executed and aligns with the Work Programme's recommendations.

WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The "Researchers at School" initiative is not sufficiently elaborated regarding its scope, frequency, and anticipated attendees. There is not enough evidence about its adequacy and feasibility, especially considering the project's large scale and ambitious goals.
- The dissemination strategy relies heavily on digital media and lacks diversity in its means of communication. This approach risks excluding parts of the population with limited access to digital platforms.
- Communication and dissemination measures proposed to maximize the impact are underdeveloped and lack suitable explanation regarding for example, the division of activities per target group as well as specific details on how the foreseen collaborations with influencers and partnerships will be sustained.
- The expected impact on improving the understanding of the European Union is insufficiently addressed.
- Certain audiences are mentioned (e.g. elderly, audiences with disabilities) but measures to reach them are not elaborated sufficiently.

- The geographic and disciplinary scope of the proposal are insufficient to meet the expected impacts under the CITIZENS Call. Similarly, the "Women-in-Science" workshop on its own is insufficient to achieve the Call's goal of promoting gender balance in science.
- The dissemination plan is insufficiently elaborated, e.g. how the participants will be engaged and how the audience will be made aware of the events is not sufficiently defined. Furthermore, the awareness campaign lacks clarity regarding communication through local, regional, or national media outlets, whether print, radio, or TV.
- The plan for communications is not fully appropriate, for example, the dissemination activities focus mainly on researchers and healthcare professionals.
- The aimed-for number of on-site participants for the European Researchers' Nights appears low, particularly in light of the substantial investment and cost of the action. Furthermore, a break-down of the estimated number of attendees expected for each specific target audience is not sufficiently evident.
- The proposal does not provide enough information on the tools to assess whether the activities are sufficiently tackling the understanding of the themes proposed.

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation # @QUA-LIT-QL @# # @WRK-PLA-WP @#


Quality and efficiency of the implementation – aspects to be taken into account

- *Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.*
- *Capacity and role of each participant, and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.*

3.1 Work plan and resources

Please provide the following:

- brief presentation of the overall structure of the work plan;
- timing of the different work packages and their components (Gantt chart or similar);
- graphical presentation of the components showing how they inter-relate (Pert chart or similar).
- detailed work description, i.e.:
 - a list of work packages (table 3.1a);
 - a description of each work package (table 3.1b);
 - a list of deliverables (table 3.1c);

 *Give full details. Base your account on the logical structure of the project and the stages in which it is to be carried out. Each work package should be*

a substantial part of the work plan, and the number of work packages should be proportionate to the scale and complexity of the project

- ⚠ *Structure each work package by breaking it down into tasks. If tasks are not appropriate, work packages can be organised according to other criteria (e.g., according to the type of work or thematically). For each task or element of the work package, describe all activities to be carried out and quantify them. Provide enough detail to clarify who will do this work and why it is needed for the project, (e.g., the level of qualification and number of person-months for personnel, as well as the requested equipment, consumables, meetings, etc.), to justify the proposed resources and so that progress can be monitored, including by the Commission*
- ⚠ *Resources assigned to work packages should be in line with their objectives and deliverables. You are advised to include a distinct work package on 'project management'*
- ⚠ *Please make sure the information in this section matches the costs as stated in the budget table in section 3 of the application forms, and the number of person months, shown in the detailed work package descriptions.*

- Provide a clearly structured work plan with well-defined work packages and tasks.
- Ensure each work package contains coherent tasks, milestones, and deliverables that support effective project monitoring and implementation.
- Demonstrate that the work plan is of high quality and efficiently organized.
- Highlight thematic work packages (e.g., NIGHT activities, Researchers@Schools), and show that tasks are logically grouped and easy to follow.
- Include a detailed breakdown of effort and resources across work packages.
- The budget, effort and resources assigned to the work packages and tasks should be reasonable. Make sure that allocation of resources in different work package is consistent with personnel cost indicated in the budget.
- Indicate that the work plan assigns adequate staff effort, budget, and material resources to each package, with transparent distribution among partners.
- Ensure that the work plan is supported by appropriate monitoring tools and indicators
- Mention deliverables and milestones placed strategically throughout the project's lifespan to enable ongoing assessment of progress.
- Present a comprehensive and coherent timeline as part of the work plan
- Use a Gantt chart and Pert chart to demonstrate how tasks and activities are scheduled and interrelated respectively, supporting the project's overall logic and feasibility.

- a list of milestones (table 3.1d);

- Choose your milestones as a tool to effectively monitor the progress of the project.
- Position your milestones throughout the lifespan of the project, not only close to or at the end of the project.
- Make a distinction between milestones and deliverables
- Make sure that they are in line with the project's objectives.

- a list of critical risks, relating to project implementation, that the stated project's objectives may not be achieved. Detail any risk mitigation measures. You will be able to update the list of critical risks and mitigation measures as the project progresses (table 3.1e);
 - Identify and analyse critical, project-specific risks and problems.
 - Create a comprehensive and detailed risk management plan (identification of relevant risks and contingency plans).
 - Do not just list the potential, inform the reviewer about how you are prepared to manage difficult situations that might occur.
 - Specify the probability and severity of each risk.
 - The list of risks should cover all planned activities and not just the most important events (Researchers' Night).
 - Think about the risks related to measuring the impact of the proposed activities.
- a table showing description and justification of subcontracting costs for each participant (table 3.1g)
 - Make sure that the budget allocation is clear and provide a sufficient justification for the amount related to subcontracting for each participant.
 - Avoid subcontracting too many major tasks; it must become clear that the consortium is in the lead of the project.
- a table showing justifications for 'purchase costs' (table 3.1h) for participants where those costs exceed 15% of the personnel costs (according to the budget table in proposal part A);
 - Explain the purchase costs for other goods, works and services in enough detail.
 - Make sure that those costs are justified for each institution in relation to its respective amount.
- if applicable, a table showing justifications for 'other costs categories' (table 3.1i).
- if applicable, a table showing in-kind contributions from third parties (table 3.1j)

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The work plan is well elaborated with appropriate work packages and relevant deliverables that will contribute to a successful implementation of the project. An impressive impact assessment tool that considers temporal dimensions and cultural, economic and social factors will efficiently monitor the project achievements.
- Tasks are clearly elaborated and appropriately assigned to partners based on their expertise.
- The budget, effort and resources assigned to the work packages and tasks are reasonable, given the expected impact. The co-funding of the activities is a warranty of a good implementation.
- The risk assessment and the corresponding mitigation measures are very well elaborated and appropriate.
- The timing of the different work packages and tasks are appropriate. The proposed deliverables and milestones are well considered and are in line with the project objectives.


- The deliverables in the work packages are well-defined and their relative independence makes them efficient for the implementation.
- The distribution of resources is well-balanced, ensuring an equitable allocation across the project partners and clear work packages plus lessons learned built in the preparation of the budget.
- The proposed resources and the split of the lump sum are sufficiently defined, appropriately allocated to the work packages, and are in line with the relevant objectives and deliverables.
- The timing of the various work packages is effective and reflects a well-coordinated schedule. Additionally, the interrelation of the work packages appropriately aligns with the project timeline.
- The assessment strategy is excellent, with clearly identified goals, incorporation of learnings from previous editions of the ERN, success indicators for each target, and a clear concept for the exploitation of the results and longer-term benefits.

WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- Risk assessment is not fully elaborated in the proposal, for example risks such as weather, logistics, or low commitment from scientists have not been considered sufficiently.
- Many elements of the work plan remain underdeveloped, with a significant portion of activities planned for elaboration post-project start. This approach introduces substantial uncertainty about the project's implementation and overall feasibility.
- The proposal does not sufficiently justify the allocation of some costs among different partners as detailed in the financial plan.
- The tasks to be carried out within each work package are very broadly defined, and are not sufficiently explained.
- The work plan lacks a suitably defined mechanism for analyzing impact, collecting, and incorporating feedback related to the Researchers' Night activities for iterative improvements, potentially hindering continuous learning.
- Risk assessment and the mitigation strategies are generic and lack specific consideration about the potential critical risks related to the project implementation, such as failure to engage researchers.
- The overall financial planning of the project lacks sufficient clarity. The justification for the level and number of activities planned is not appropriately clear.
- The WP descriptions are inadequate because they are addressed generically and do not sufficiently identify in a structured way the actions belonging to each WP.
- The budget allocation is unclear and the justification for the amount related to subcontracting and purchase costs is not sufficiently provided.
- The impact assessment methodology and implementation is addressed insufficiently. Furthermore, it is not clear if an impact assessment will be conducted with professional methods and personnel.
- The timing of the different work packages and their tasks are not defined sufficiently.
- The distribution of tasks within the work packages is very complex with every partner taking part in every aspect, e.g. the combination of the Awareness Campaign and Researchers at Schools initiative in one package lacks clarity and detracts from the focused implementation of each initiative.
- Insufficient distinction is made between deliverables and milestones which impedes effective monitoring.
- Key managerial risks are insufficiently addressed, such as insufficient number of involved researchers, or change in managerial staff.

- The proposal does not identify sufficiently strong measures to promote gender balance, diversity and inclusiveness with clear plans to ensure participation of nonstereotypical researchers as potential role models.
- The balance of resource allocation between work packages and across partners is insufficiently justified.
- The risk assessment does not sufficiently address the vital risk of insufficient participants for the planned activities. Furthermore, risk-mitigation measures mainly rely on ordinary project activities rather than describing a plan to tackle unexpected incidents.
- The timing and interrelation of the different tasks is not explained with sufficient granularity to assess their efficacy.

3.2 Capacity of participants and consortium as a whole #@CON-SOR-CS@# #@PRJ-MGT-PM@#

 *The individual participants of the consortium are described in a separate section under Part A. There is no need to repeat that information here.*

- Describe the consortium. How does it match the project's objectives, and bring together the necessary knowledge.
 - Demonstrate the role and the experience of the coordinator and of the other participating organisations against their specific thematic background and professional expertise.
 - Highlight the track record of the coordinator and the other organisations in this kind of activity.
 - Describe the partners expertise that is aligned with the project's objectives, inform the reviewers how this ensures that the project benefits from diverse perspectives and a holistic approach.
 - Mention former successful collaborations of the participating institutions. This makes the success of the current project more credible.
 - Give an overview of the mix of the consortium, it should consist of institutions from different sectors with special expertise and knowledge; i.e. Universities, organisations of the non-academic sector, NGOs, Schools, Research Organisations, public institutions or representations, Cities, Communities, institutions specialising in public engagement, etc. (there is no need to have institutions from all these sectors, but highlight the various sectors that are part of your consortium)
- Describe how the members complement one another.
 - All roles should be clear, the experience should be complementary, each institution should have at least one special focus
 - Each partner brings unique expertise, such as research, public engagement, and event management, ensuring a comprehensive approach to the project.
 - Partners complement each other by combining their strengths in research, outreach, and communication to create a robust and well-rounded project execution.
- In what way does each of them contribute to the project? Show that each has a valid role, and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.

- The role of every participating organisation must be briefly described and justified. If the role or the added value of one institution is unclear, it probably should not be part of the consortium
- There should be no doubt that one institution might not have the capacity (e.g. staff, experience, etc) to fulfil the respective task(s).
- Describe the partners expertise that is aligned with the project's objectives, inform the reviewers how this ensures that the project benefits from diverse perspectives and a holistic approach.

#§CON-SOR-CS§# #§PRJ-MGT-PM§#

STRENGTHS – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The consortium is strategically composed of partners with extensive experience in these types of activities and a range of skills essential for the project's success.
- The consortium presents a track record of projects and dissemination actions that support their excellence in this kind of activity.
- The capacity of each participant is very substantiated and diverse. All partners have clear roles and support with their experiences and networks.
- The consortium is strong and experienced in carrying out this type of events to ensure that the work programme can be undertaken efficiently, effectively and professionally.
- All partners have complementary roles and the distribution of tasks and roles among partners is very well balanced. In addition, the consortium is supported by an impressive network of stakeholders who bring additional valuable expertise.
- The consortium comprises SMEs, NGOs, a university, and partners from various sectors, providing a mix of excellent skills and networking capabilities that are diverse and complementary.
- Complementarity of beneficiaries is sound and well-declared in the proposal, comprising of different research fields and disciplines, sectors, international relations, and relevant roles in allocated responsibilities. The proposed consortium and management structure ensure effective decision-making, highlighting the consortium's capacity for successful project execution.
- The consortium brings together all the necessary expertise to run large science dissemination events in the region spanning diverse academic disciplines, and it positively relies on a long track record of collaboration.
- The role and experience of the coordinator and other participants are convincingly demonstrated in relation to their specific backgrounds in thematic or crosscutting subjects.
- The partners are diverse, relevant and strong contributors, with excellent track records, evident complementarity and experience and clear capacity to deliver a strong programme
- The consortium is very well suited to execute the proposal. comprising a large panel of research institutions as well as public engagement institutions. The consortium as a whole is well experienced in organizing public events, and in particular the Researchers' Night.

WEAKNESSES – EXAMPLES FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

- The consortium does not demonstrate convincing expertise in science engagement activities which will be necessary for the foreseen activities such as exhibitions, quizzes, etc.
- Substantiation of the necessary experience and capacity of the partners is addressed insufficiently.
- The complementarity of the partners is not sufficiently identified. The roles and responsibilities for each partner within the proposed project are insufficiently clear.
- It is not sufficiently clear how the complementarity and capacities of partners work together for the smooth implementation of the project.

- The expertise required to organize the proposed activities is not appropriately described. Roles and responsibilities are not adequately aligned with individuals possessing the relevant expertise, particularly in the area of science communication to the public.
- The specific roles and contributions of each Consortium member for the various Work Packages are not clearly defined, therefore it is insufficiently justified how and to what extent each member will contribute to the project.
- The proposal fails to provide sufficient information for some of the participating partners of the consortium.
- Although external partnerships are mentioned to support the implementation, little information is available regarding the process of setting up these partnerships. It is therefore not clear to what extent the consortium will have access to the involved broader expertise.
- There is insufficient identification of the responsibilities of the organisations involved in the project. Their specific roles therefore lack clarity and conviction.
- The specific role and contribution of each partner is insufficiently defined.

- **Other countries and international organisations:**

Note that for CSAs in Horizon Europe, except when explicitly allowed in the topic, any entity from a non-associated third country and International Organisations (other than International European Research Organisations) can only participate as Associated Partners. There is no difference between entities established in low/middle income countries and developed countries.

- ⚠ If your topic does not include any specific condition related to non-associated third countries, you do not need to include any information on 'Other countries and international organisations in this section of the proposal.
- ⚠ If your topic includes a specific condition related to non-associated third countries, note that legal entities established in those countries are only able to participate as beneficiaries or affiliated entities if eligible for funding:
 - because they are from a low/middle income country identified in the Work Programme General Annexes B as automatically eligible for funding;
 - because the call conditions explicitly provide for it;
 - because the participation of the legal entity concerned is deemed essential for implementing the action.

Only in the latter case, explain in this section of the proposal why the participation of the entity in question is essential to successfully carry out the project.

Tables for section 3.1

- ⚠ *Use plain text for the tables in section 3.1. If the proposal is invited to start Grant Agreement preparation, these tables will have to be encoded in the grant management IT tool, where no graphics or special formats are supported.*

Table 3.1a: List of work packages, please use the Work Package structure below


Work package No	Work Package Title	Lead Participant No	Lead Participant Short Name	Person-Months	Start Month	End month
1	Awareness campaign	Use the number from the list of participants and the administrative proposal forms	Use organisation short names from Participants Table			
2	Activities during the NIGHT					
3	Researchers at Schools activities					
4	Impact assessment					
5	Management					

Table 3.1b: Work package description

- You might need a lot of space for the work package descriptions, this might take around 10 pages overall

For each work package:

Work package number	
Work package title	

 *Participants involved in each WP and their efforts are shown in table 3.1f. Lead participant and starting and end date of each WP are shown in table 3.1a.)*

Objectives

Description of work (where appropriate, broken down into tasks), lead partner and role of participants. For each task, quantify the amount of work. Provide enough detail to justify the resources requested and clarify why the work is needed and who will do it. Deliverables linked to each WP are listed in table 3.1c (no need to repeat the information here).

- Provide adequate, i.e. detailed, information on the tasks and their timeline
- Justify the requested resources for each participant, be specific.
- Clearly allocate the tasks to the respective participant and the respective WP, it must be clear who does what.

Examples:

WP 1:

- Awareness Campaign - Communication Activities (include target audience)
- Awareness Campaign - Communication Campaign (communication tools, messages to be conveyed, promotional material)
- Pre-events and Post Events.
- Other possible tasks.

WP 4:

- Description of the State of the Art related with public engagement with science....
- Task 1 Impact Assessment NIGHT activities Year 1
- Task 2 Impact Assessment RESEARCHERS AT SCHOOL activities Year 1
- Task 3 Impact Assessment NIGHT activities Year 2
- Task 4 Impact Assessment RESEARCHERS AT SCHOOL activities Year 2

Use a separate table for each work package.

Number	Deliverable name	Short description	Work package number	Short name of lead participant	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery date (in months)
D1.1 (<WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>) → D.1.1, D.1.2...D.2.1, D.2.2...D.3.1., D.3.2. etc.	<p>Report on the Awareness campaign</p> <p>In case you organize two NIGHT events, number the respective deliverables accordingly, i.e. "Report on the Awareness campaign 1" and "2"</p> <p>This applies to all the deliverables.</p>			Use organisation short names from list of participants and administrative proposal forms		PU, CO, CI (see note). Note that PU means that once validated by the EC, the deliverable can be published on a freely accessible website.	<p>(In months elapsed from the start of the project) e.g., M6, M12</p> <p>The dates always depend on the starting date of your action.</p>
	Report on Activities during the NIGHT						12
	Report on the Researchers at Schools activities						12
	Impact assessment report						12
	Management report						12
	Report on the Awareness campaign						24
	Report on Activities during the NIGHT						24
	Report on the Researchers at Schools activities						24

	Impact assessment report						24
	Management report						24

Table 3.1c: List of Deliverables, please include the deliverables below

<p>KEY 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.</p> <p>Type: Use one of the following codes: R: Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports) DEM: Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs DEC: Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc. DATA: Data sets, microdata, etc. DMP: Data management plan ETHICS: Deliverables related to ethics issues. SECURITY: Deliverables related to security issues OTHER: Software, technical diagram, algorithms, models, etc.</p> <p>Dissemination level: Use one of the following codes: PU – Public, fully open, e.g. web (Deliverables flagged as public will be automatically published in CORDIS project's page) SEN – Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement Classified R-UE/EU-R – EU RESTRICTED under the Commission Decision No2015/444 Classified C-UE/EU-C – EU CONFIDENTIAL under the Commission Decision No2015/444 Classified S-UE/EU-S – EU SECRET under the Commission Decision No2015/444</p> <p>Delivery date Measured in months from the project start date (month 1)</p>

Table 3.1d: List of milestones

Milestone number	Milestone name	Related work package(s)	Due date (in month)	Means of verification
1., 2., 3. etc. No need to use 1.1.,	e.g. starting awareness campaign,	Milestones can be related to various work packages, thus only	(In months elapsed from the start of the project) e.g., M6, M12	Cf. below Examples might be:

1.2., 1.3 as it is with the deliverables	project kick-off, NIGHT programme ready etc.	single numbers for milestones in the first column.		Press release ready Evaluation study finished Video documentary published. ...

KEY

Due date

Measured in months from the project start date (month 1)

Means of verification

Show how you will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype that is 'up and running'; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated.

Table 3.1e: Critical risks for implementation # @RSK-MGT-RM@ #

Description of risk (indicate level of (i) likelihood, and (ii) severity: Low/Medium/High)	Work package(s) involved	Proposed risk-mitigation measures
<p>e.g. change of location, bad weather conditions, transport issues such as strike...</p> <p>Indicate the level of likelihood and severity, the combination should not be "likelihood: high – severity: high"</p> <p>Make sure that no risk endangers the whole project</p>	Risks are often related to more than one work package	

Definition critical risk:

A critical risk is a plausible event or issue that could have a high adverse impact on the ability of the project to achieve its objectives.

Level of likelihood to occur: Low/medium/high

The likelihood is the estimated probability that the risk will materialise even after taking account of the mitigating measures put in place.

Level of severity: Low/medium/high

The relative seriousness of the risk and the significance of its effect.

\$RSK-MGT-RM\$

Table 3.1f: Summary of staff effort

Please indicate the number of person/months over the whole duration of the planned work, for each work package, for each participant. Identify the work-package leader for each WP by showing the relevant person-month figure in bold.

	WPn	WPn+1	WPn+2	Total Person-Months per Participant
Participant Number/Short Name				
Participant Number/Short Name				
Participant Number/Short Name				
Total Person Months				

Table 3.1g: 'Subcontracting costs' items

For each participant describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted (please note that core tasks of the project should not be sub-contracted).

Participant Number/Short Name		
	Cost (€)	Description of tasks and justification
Subcontracting		

Table 3.1h: 'Purchase costs' items (travel and subsistence, equipment and other goods, works and services)

Please complete the table below for each participant if the purchase costs (i.e. the sum of the costs for 'travel and subsistence', 'equipment', and 'other goods, works and services') exceeds 15% of the personnel costs for that participant (according to the budget table in proposal part A). The record must list cost items in order of costs and starting with the largest cost item, up to the level that the remaining costs are below 15% of personnel costs.

Participant Number/Short Name		
	Cost (€)	Justification
Travel and subsistence		
Equipment		
Other goods, works and services		
Remaining purchase costs (<15% of pers. Costs)		
Total		

Table 3.1i: 'Other costs categories' items (e.g. internally invoiced goods and services)

Please complete the table below for each participant that would like to declare costs under other costs categories (e.g. internally invoiced goods and services), irrespective of the percentage of personnel costs.

Participant Number/Short Name		
	Cost (€)	Justification
Internally invoiced goods and services		
...		

Table 3.1j: 'In-kind contributions' provided by third parties

Please complete the table below for each participant that will make use of in-kind contributions (non-financial resources made available free of charge by third parties). In kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge are declared by the participants as eligible direct costs in the corresponding cost category (e.g. personnel costs or purchase costs for equipment).

Participant Number/Short Name			
Third party name	Category	Cost (€)	Justification
	Select between Seconded personnel		

	Travel and subsistence Equipment Other goods, works and services Internally invoiced goods and services		

#\$QUA-LIT-QL\$# # \$WRK-PLA-WP\$#