Marie Skłodowska-Curie IF is part of a wider set of programmes of the European Commission, for the development of European Research, to promote researcher’s mobility, training and excellence in Europe.

It also promotes through the international part of the programme the mobility of researchers, training and European excellence world wide.
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The overall Framework of the EC actions
- Innovative Training Networks (ITN)
- Innovative doctoral-level training providing a range of skills in order to maximise employability
- **Individual Fellowships (IF)**
  - Support for Experienced Researchers undertaking mobility between countries, optionally to the non-academic sector
- **Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)**
  - International and intersectoral collaboration through the exchange of research and innovation staff
- **Co-funding of regional, national and international programmes (COFUND)**
  - Co-financing high-quality fellowship or doctoral programmes with transnational mobility
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The Topics
- Chemistry (CHE)
- Social Sciences and Humanities (SOC)
- Economic Sciences (ECO)
- Information Science and Engineering (ENG)
- Environment and Geosciences (ENV)
- Life Sciences (LIF)
- Mathematics (MAT) and Physics (PHY).
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The Panels 2017
- **Standard European Fellowships** (each area has a separate ranking list) The core of the call.
  - 7,139 proposals (2015)
- **Career Restart Panel (EF-CAR)** 248 proposals 2015
- **Reintegration Panel (EF-RI)** 509 proposals 2015
- **Society & Enterprise Panel (EF-SE)** (10M budget-means around 25 fellowships) 134 proposals 2015

**Global Fellowships (GF)** (for non-associated countries) 12 months return phase 33,700,000
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I have 20-30 minutes, to make a presentation for you, and my objectives are:

- To give you a general idea of what the Marie Curie fellowships are for those who pay for them, (not what you think they are and probably you would want to be)
- To explain you the evaluation process of your proposals and the priorities
- And finally give some advise if it worth the effort to participate and some tips to maximize your chances.

My objective is not to give you details and a complete training. It would need far more time and preparation.

You can evaluate my effort after the end of this presentation and the degree I achieved them.

CONCLUSION

Define clearly your objectives in your application within the context of the call. You are evaluated for them and against them. You have a budget, a timeschedule, a framework of what is required and funded.
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Under the Marie Curie actions I participated in the following evaluations the last years in the ECOSOC Panel (HORIZON 2020) as an expert in the fields of, development, cultural heritage, tourism, environment and new advanced digital technologies

- 2015 Evaluator expert H2020-TWINN-2015-, for the promotion of excellence in the research of lower performing EU and Associated countries
- 2014 Evaluator expert, H2020-MSCA-IF-2014 Evaluations – ECOSOC panel, EF-ST,
- 2013 Evaluator expert FP7-PEOPLE-2013-IEF-IIF-IOF –ECO-SOC Panel
- 2012 Evaluator expert FP7-PEOPLE-2012-IEF-IIF-IOF Marie Curie People ECO-SOC Panel,
- 2013 Evaluator /expert FP7 PEOPLE 2013 "Initial Training Networks" (ITN) Call ECO-SOC
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## Marie Curie Individual Fellowships: Scope and Evaluation Process

### Table: Researcher Unit Cost vs. Institutional Unit Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher Unit Cost [person/month]</th>
<th>Institutional Unit Cost [person/month]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living allowance*</td>
<td>Research, training &amp; networking costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility allowance</td>
<td>Management &amp; overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Fellowships</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted through the application of a country correction coefficient*
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IF – Part B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
START PAGE COUNT

1. SUMMARY
2. EXCELLENCE
3. IMPACT
4. IMPLEMENTATION

MAX 10 pages

STOP PAGE COUNT

5. CV OF THE EXPERIENCED RESEARCHER (max 5 pages)
6. CAPACITIES OF THE PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS (max 1 page for the Beneficiary; max 0.5 page for Partner Organisation in the GF)
7. ETHICAL ASPECTS
8. LETTERS OF COMMITMENT OF PARTNER ORGANISATIONS (only for GF)
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- **Excellence**  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 the researcher and the host
  - Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution
  - Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence
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Impact 30%
- Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results
- Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences
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- **Quality and efficiency of the implementation 20%**
  - Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
  - Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
  - Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management
  - Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)
5. CV of the Experienced Researcher

This section should be limited to maximum 5 pages and should include the standard academic and research record. Any research career gaps and/or unconventional paths should be clearly explained so that this can be fairly assessed by the independent evaluators.

The Experienced Researchers must provide a list of achievements reflecting their track, and this may include, if applicable:

1. Publications in major international peer-reviewed multi-disciplinary scientific journals and/or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings and/or monographs of their respective research fields, indicating also the number of citations (excluding self-citations) they have attracted.
2. Granted patent(s).
3. Research monographs, chapters in collective volumes and any translations thereof.
4. Invited presentations to peer-reviewed, internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools.
5. Research expeditions that the Experienced Researcher has led.
6. Organisation of International conferences in the field of the applicant (membership in the steering and/or programme committee).
7. Examples of leadership in industrial innovation.
8. Prizes and Awards.
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- **Overall threshold 70 / 100**
- Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Decimal points may be given.
- The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:
  - 0 – 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. Proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
  - 3 – Good. Proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
  - 4 – Very Good. Proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
  - 5 – Excellent. Proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.
Successful proposals to my experience in ECOSOC have to reach the zone of 4,5 – 5 to all criteria (at the upper scale of 95 /100), particularly in excellence, to have good chances to be funded.
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- The Strengths / Weaknesses scheme
MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS
SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Remote ‘Individual Evaluation Reports’ (IERs)
- Each proposal is assigned to at least 3 Evaluators
- Evaluators submit all their IERs by ????

Quality check
- CVC check the first 2 IERs (completeness, consistency, length)
- CVC send a feedback to evaluators via SEP ‘task comments’ or via an email.
- CVC inform Panel Co about any significant issue
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Evaluators

- Multidiscipline and multi-professional origin
- Different scientific sensitivities
- Overall view – impression – comparative approach
- Details importance
- Negotiations process (limited time, personals strong views, complementarity, compromise)
- Extreme cases and process to deal with
- The role of the vice-chairs and the Commission services
The statistics (average estimate depends on the year 2015) in link

- **27 November 2014 12:13** A total of 7472 proposals were submitted in response to this call. The number of proposal for each topic is shown below:
  - European Fellowships (EF): 6,425 proposals (86% of the total)
  - Global Fellowships (GF): 1,047 proposals (14% of the total).

- A number of 1256 grant agreements have been successfully signed so far. No more than 16,8% will find their way to funding. It seems low but.....
Don’t desperate!
The real statistics are rather different.
- A small number of proposals is rejected for administrative reasons.
- Another part, not insignificant, is bellow or around the threshold, or just very bad, out of competition. In my experience this part is around the 30% of each call (however it can vary considerably depending on the topic and call).
- The vast majority of the proposals are acceptable, good, above the threshold, but far from the fundable zone. Another 30% approx.
- The remaining 30-35%, are your real competitors.

Don’t forget that we are talking about excellence and you compete with the excellent. If you feel so, you have about 1 out of 2,5 chances to succeed.
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Some advises

- If you submit a “trash” proposal, with no effort, you don’t lose almost anything. You give more and easy work for the evaluators. The one who looses is the university and the supervisor’s reputation given that following the rules: *The submission of the proposal falls under the full responsibility of the applicant organisation represented by the main supervisor (and any other action that follows this procedure such as withdrawal or request for evaluation review). ... it is emphasised that the submission by the researcher must be made with the agreement of the main supervisor.*

- If you believe that your proposal is around average scoring, you will probably invest some time and you will lose it. Hopefully it can serve as an exercise for a next call.

- If you really have a good idea, a great research topic, and you’re ready to put the necessary effort go-on, take your chances! At the end, in the worse case, you will have advanced your existing research and you will have the opportunity of feedback, resubmit and improve.

Again a “but”.....:
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Don’t forget that
Success does not depend only on the excellence of the research proposed although it is a condition sine qua non.

- This is a training action. You must prove what and how you’re going to learn, and, persuasively how you will benefit from that (you and the host).
- Not only you need an adequate supervisor/s and a corresponding institution but you have to prove it.
- You must prove that you know, how to implement, you have a consistent implementation plan, you are aware of the risks, it and demonstrate it clearly.
- You need to address all the topics, however boring they seem to you (impact, European added value, wide public, scientific community dissemination e.t.c.). Don’t forget that this is taxpayers money, and the Commission want the taxpayers to know what they pay for. Additionally this is not paid by the member states, but from European funds. You must explain why your proposal is of European interest.
- Don’t tire the evaluators. Make it easy for them to understand, to localize the necessary information in the corresponding sections, (refer to it when it is presented already elsewhere to avoid repetition and save pages). Structure clearly your text
- Maximize in all criteria the STRENGTHS. No significant WEAKNESSES are allowed for winners usually. Only few of minor importance (unavoidable) will not reduce considerably your chances.
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Good Luck

and

Questions

(?)

Georgios Giannoulis Giannoulopoulos

ggiannoulisg@yahoo.com