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Why?

• European research area
• Cutting edge science
• Expertise
• Experience
• Technology
• Training
• Networking
• Collaborations
• Career development
• Links to industry
Who?

- Leading EU expertise
- Qualified supervisor
- Complementary skills
- Top-level infrastructure
- Academic-Industry
- Career development
- Soft skills experts
How?

- English
- Need a vision
- Credible
- Feasible
- Original
- Synergies
- Value added
- Interdisciplinary
- Societal impact
- Training/career impact
What makes an ideal IF?

Remember: Quite a few IFs funded every year
-yet very competitive

• Innovative science that has clear added value for EU
• Top-level research with specific training objectives
• A reactive, well organized and highly qualified supervisor
• A unique training perspective
• Professional training in relevant soft skills
• Relevant industrial interaction (in research or training)

Credible & Feasible
How to put together a competitive IF

An innovative project that adds value to career development – credible and feasible

• Parts of project that are synergistic and complementary, yet fit well together
• Acquisition of new technical and conceptual skills - training
• Ample use of figures, schemes, charts/flow charts to simplify message for potential non-specialists
• Ability to modulate project in the event of potential hurdles, i.e. contingencies
• Sufficient time to have project read through by colleagues

Specific with examples
What is important?

- Credible scientific objectives, innovative project, cutting edge research
- Clear management structure
- Risk assessment and how deal with problems (scientific or otherwise)
- Acquiring relevant soft skills
- Gender balance
- Clear dissemination and exploitation strategies
- Real interdisciplinarity that makes scientific sense

Credible & Feasible
Award Criteria

- Evaluation scores awarded for each criteria from 0 to 5
- Each award criterion has a weighting
- Total score is subject to a threshold of 70%
- Proposals ranked
- Proposals funded in ranking order
- Evaluation summary reports provided
- No restrictions on re-application

**Interpretation of the score:**

0– The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1– Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2– Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

3– Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

4– Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

5– Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.
IF evaluation criteria

- **Criteria 1 – Excellence (Weight 50%)**
  - Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects
  - Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between researcher and the host
  - Quality of the supervision and the integration in the team/institution
  - Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce profession maturity/independence during the fellowship

- **Criteria 2 – Impact (Weight 30%)**
  - Enhancing the future research career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship
  - Quality of the proposed measure to exploit and disseminate the project results
  - Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences

- **Criteria 3 – Implementation (Weight 20%)**
  - Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including the appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
  - Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures including risk management
  - Appropriateness of institutional environment (infrastructure)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do’s</strong></th>
<th><strong>and</strong></th>
<th><strong>Don’ts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Original, timely, innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forget risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance to European research area</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unequal task/resource distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good interconnections</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Artificial collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Overly detailed scientifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Justify tasks and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trainings lacking detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Justify skill set acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use professional companies lacking scientific experience and/or credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevant training from diverse sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too complex or too many deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring/career plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forget to address gender balance, where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complementary/synergistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inadequate dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forget overall objectives/goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>