Marie Skłodowska-Curie teadlasvahetus

2026.a taotlusvoor

Kristin Kraav
Eesti Teadusagentuur
kristin.kraav@etag.ee

Täna tuleb juttu:

- Sissejuhatus MSCA meetmetesse
- MSCA teadlasvahetuse meetme
  - Eesmärgid
  - Tingimused
  - Rahastus
  - Taotlemine
  - Hindamine
- Mis on uut võrreldes varasemate voorudega
- Hindamisraportite analüüs
- MSCA Staff Exchanges projekt LocalLing



Euroopa horisont



MSCA eesmärgid ja põhimõtted

- MSCA meetmete eesmärgiks on toetada teadlaste **oskuste** ja **karjääri arengut**
- MSCA toetab **rahvusvahelist, sektoritevahelist** ja **teadusvaldkondade vahelist** koostööd
- Erinevate mobiilsusmeetmete kaudu toetatakse teadlasi **kogu nende karjääri vältel**, alates doktorantidest
- MSCA on avatud **iga teadusvaldkonna** teadlastele

MSCA meetmed

Marie Skłodowska-Curie meetmete (MSCA) eesmärk on toetada teadlaste oskuste ja karjääri arengut andes teadlastele võimaluse saada kogemusi eri riikides ja sektorites. Marie Skłodowska-Curie meetmete kaudu toetatakse igas vanuses ja igal karjääriastmel olevaid teadlasi, kes võivad olla pärit mistahes riigist. MSCA on avatud kõigile teadusvaldkondadele.

1. MSCA Doctoral Networks	→ doktoriõppe võrgustikud
2. MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships	→ järeldoktorigrandid
3. MSCA Staff Exchanges	→ teadustöötajate vahetus
4. MSCA Cofund ja Choose Europe for Science	→ doktori- ja järeldoktoriprogrammide kaasrahastamine
5. MSCA and Citizens	→ avalikkusele suunatud üritused (Teadlaste öö)

MSCA teadlasvahetus

Eesmärk: rahvusvahelise, sektoritevahelise ja valdkondade vahelise teaduskoostöö toetamine teadlasvahetuse kaudu; sobiv vahend teadusprojektide toetamiseks

Sihtrühm: kõik teadustööga seotud töötajad

Kestus: kuni 48 kuud; üks töötaja kuni 12 kuud

Maht kuni 360 lähetuskuud

Taotlusvoorud:

- 16. dets 2025 – 16. apr 2026
- 15. dets 2026 – 15. apr 2027



Eesti osalusega edukad projektid 2021.-2024.a voorudes:

- HEPINIB (Tervisetehnoloogiate Arenduskeskus)
- MAKINGHISTORIES (TLÜ)
- RETEX (OÜ Spell Disain)
- VOLATEVS (EMÜ – koordinaator)
- BETTERXPS (TÜ – koordinaator)
- HUMLIT (TÜ, TLÜ jt)
- ORCA (TalTech)
- LocalLing (TLÜ – koordinaator)
- AeroNet (JIO ESTONIA OÜ)
- I-CIVIC (TLÜ + Kistler-Ritso SA)
- NEO-LIFE (Celvia CC AS)
- SMAR3TS (TalTech jt)
- POLCA (EBS)
- TULIP (TÜ, Celvia)

MSCA teadustöötajate vahetuse põhieesmärgid

- Teadustöötajate sektoritevahelised, rahvusvahelised ja interdistsiplinaarsed lähetused
- Teadmussiire konsortsiumi liikmete vahel
- Koostöö akadeemilise ja ettevõtlussektori (sh VKEde) vahel
- Koostöö EL ja teiste riikide vahel

Mida teadlasvahetus annab?

Töötajad



Organisatsioonid

Novelties

Greater flexibility to support 3-way mobility

- **Same-sector secondments** now allowed; **international cooperation** strongly encouraged
  - Removal of requirement for a non-associated third country (when all partners were in the same sector)
  - Both academic and non-academic sectors must be involved
- Removal of the **"one-month rule"** before secondment

Skills development

- Enhanced skills development section

Minimum threshold

- New minimum threshold of 3 in each evaluation criteria

Unit cost

- Increased to €2,870 per month

European Commission

Osalejad

Akadeemiline sektor

Konsortsium: **vähemalt 3 asutust kolmest eri riigist**, sh 2 neist erinevast EL liikmesriigist või assotsieerunud riigist

Mitte-akadeemiline sektor

Konsortsium peab sisaldama **nii akadeemilisi kui mitteakadeemilisi** organisatsioone

* Lähetused EL liikmesriikide / Euroopa horisondiga assotsieerunud riikide vahel peavad reeglina olema eri sektorite vahel, võimalikud on ka interdistsiplinaarsed lähetused sama sektori sees

Lähetatavad teadustöötajad

Teadustööga seotud töötajad – teadlased, tehniline personal, teadusadministraatorid

Teadlased igal karjääriastmel, alates doktorantidest kuni kogenud teadlasteni

Ühe töötaja lähetuse kestus on minimaalselt üks kuu (seda võib tükeldada) ja maksimaalselt 12 kuud

Lähetuse ajal peal töötaja täisajaga pühenduma projektile

Pärast lähetust naaseb töötaja teda saatnud organisatsiooni

Rahastusele kvalifitseeruvad lähetused



* *Associated Partners eligible for funding (see List of Participating Countries in Horizon Europe)*

Sama riigi piires ei saa töötajaid vahetada.
Kolmandate riikide vahel ei saa töötajaid vahetada.

MSCA teadustöötajate vahetus - rahastus

NB! Lähetav organisatsioon jätkab palga maksmist lähetuse ajal, projekt katab lisakulud



Lähetused Euroopas (LR/AR) sama sektori sees

- Lubatud, kui lähetusi loetakse **interdistsiplinaarseteks**

- **Interdistsiplinaarsuse ranget definitsiooni enam ei ole,** kuid aitab varasem definitsioon: *interdistsiplinaarseks loetakse lähetusi, mis integreerivad kaht või enamat teadusvaldkonda* = MSCA esimese taseme märksõna (vt märksõnade loetelu REA veebilehel)

Kokkuvõte

KESTUS
4 aastat
360 lähetuskuud

LÄHETUSED
1-12 kuud töötaja kohta; sektorite- või rahvusvahelised; sama sektori vahel Euroopa sees interdistsiplinaarsed

ÜHIKUHIND
5170 €
2870 € - Töötaja lähetuskulud
2300 € - projekti tegevusteks ja juhtimiseks

EELARVE
Taotlusvooru eelarve 2026: 97,92 mln €; 2027: 95,04 mln €

Hindamiskriteeriumid

Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
Quality and pertinence of the project's **research and innovation objectives** (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)	Developing new and lasting **research collaborations**, achieving **transfer of knowledge** between participating organisations and contributing to improving **research and innovation potential** at the European and global level	Quality and effectiveness of the **work plan**, assessment of **risks**, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages
Soundness of the proposed approach to foster **international, intersectoral and interdisciplinary collaborations**	Credibility of the measures to enhance the **career perspectives** of staff members and contribution to their **skills development**	Quality, capacity and role of **each participant**, including **hosting arrangements** and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise
Soundness of the **proposed methodology** (including consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)	Suitability and quality of the measures to **maximise expected outcomes and impacts**, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities	
Quality of the proposed **interaction between the participating organisations** in light of the research and innovation objectives	The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected **scientific, societal and economic impacts**	
50%	30%	20%

NEW!

Taotluse struktuur

Part A - administrative forms

filled *on-line on the Funding & Tenders Opportunities Portal*

Part B1 - the proposal, max 32 pages (PDF uploaded)

 # Start page (1 page), table of contents (1 page), list of participating organisations

 # Excellence

 # Impact

 # Implementation

Maximum 30 pages

Excess pages disregarded

Part B2 - no page limit, PDF uploaded

 # Participating organisations (including 1 p per Beneficiaries and ½ pg per Associated partners and non-academic beneficiaries table) and

Explanation for the use of generetive AI in the preparation of the proposal (when applicable)

Environmental considerations in light of the MSCA Green Charter

MSCA teadustöötajate vahetus - ajakava

Taotlusvoor avaneb	Tähtaeg	Vooru eelarve
16. dets 2025	16. aprill 2026 (17:00 Brüsseli aja järgi)	97,92 mln eur
15. dets 2026	16. aprill 2025	95,04 mln eur

Infoallikad



- MSCA 2026-2027 tööprogramm
- Taotlusvooru veebileht
  (*Funding & Tenders portaalis*)
- REA MSCA veebileht
- RADIANCE projekti materjalid
  - Käsiraamatud
  - Partnerotsing
  - jpm
- MSCA partnerotsingu platvorm

MSCA

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions

Developing talents, advancing research



Analysis of Evaluation Summary Reports

Liene Ekša, Kristin Kraav, Justyna Lučinska, Viktoras Mongirdas



Award criteria:

- Excellence
- Impact
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Excellence



- ✓ The project's research/innovation objectives
- ✓ Ambition
- ✓ Goes beyond state-of-the-art

- ✓ Methodology, including 3 «i»
- ✓ Gender dimension & other diversity aspects
- ✓ Open science practices

- ✓ Quality of interaction between involved organizations

Weighting – 50%

Excellence

1.1. Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The proposal **perfectly clarifies** its objectives, as well the **way to measure** and **verify** them. The objectives are very **well argued and ambitious**. + The **description of the objectives is clear** and supports highly innovative, beyond the state of art research. + The methodology **to achieve** the overall objectives is well described. + The objectives are **directly aligned with the project's work packages,** therefore becoming easily **measurable and verifiable**.	- The stated **objectives are overambitious** and not adequately justified. - The proposers have not sufficiently described tangible **ways to measure and verify the objectives** and **assess how they can be achieved realistically.** - The actual **means of** making the necessary **measurements** of the research and innovation objectives is **not clearly explained**.

Excellence

1.1. Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The proposal presents a **convincing state-of-the-art analysis**, providing a relevant contextual background to the research. + The **originality and innovative aspects** of the research programme are convincingly demonstrated. + Expertise and methods from different disciplines are **brought together with a convincing identification** of how they will be integrated to pursuit the objectives. + While the project is high-risk, the **preliminary results are a strength**. The **prior work done** by the consortium partners greatly supports the likelihood of achieving the set objectives. (Applying state-of-the-art techniques and developing **new assays to analysis.)**	- The **innovation and ambition** of the proposed research work are **low**. - The proposers have **not provided sufficiently clear descriptions** of any of the **novel approaches**. - The **state-of-the art is not clearly specified** in the proposal, and the description of the proposed work is insufficiently focused. - The **novelty** of the proposal, along with its **innovative character**, are not convincingly presented or proved. - The proposal is **not adequately embedded** in the current the state of the art and has **limited references** to current literature and debate within academia.

Excellence

1.2. Soundness of the proposed methodology (including international, interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The **use of methods** is very good, sensible, and coherent. The training sets, and extra data to be captured, are **robust and of high technical merit** considering the applied nature of the proposal. + The clearly multidisciplinary methodology is **well described**, **credible** and **in line with** the project's **objectives**. + Interdisciplinary aspects are excellently considered, and the **combination of academic and SME** sector participants both in EU and third countries is convincing and suitable for achieving the objectives. + The adopted **interdisciplinary,** comparative and **inter-sectoral** approach is **well described** and **very relevant** for the achievement of the project objectives.	- The overall methodology of the proposal is **insufficiently described.** - Some of the methods proposed for the planned activities are **only mentioned briefly** without sufficient details. - The methodological approaches **do not cover** the whole spectrum of the **specific objectives** of the project. - The interdisciplinary aspect of the proposal is **not sufficiently described** in a convincing way.

Excellence

1.2. Soundness of the proposed methodology (including international, interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ Open science is very **well addressed,** with all code and parameters stored in a publicly accessible repository to facilitate reproducibility. There is an **excellent explanation** of open publication and dissemination. There is clear consideration for **publicly available** datasets and the need for supplementary data capture. + The proposal includes a **clear statement** on the implementation of open science practices and the handling of **data management** in line with the principles of **FAIR.** + Gender dimension is **sufficiently taken into consideration.**	- There is **a lack of specific gender dimension actions** when defining tasks related to the initial definition of design requirements and tasks related to the users. - Diversity components (confounding factors beyond gender) are **not discussed as clearly** as gender, despite the fact that the cohorts are highly local and culturally distinct. - The open science practices **are too vaguely** presented. The proposal does not convincingly describe **measures regarding open science** practices, their motivation and rationale. - The data management plan **is not in alignment** with FAIR principles.

Excellence

1.3. Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The quality of the proposed interactions and the expertise of the staff is **clearly articulated**. Furthermore, trans-disciplinary **collaboration is carefully prepared,** […]based on partner meetings/seminars/workshops/summer schools. + The **contribution of each participating organisation** to the research objectives and knowledge sharing goals and mechanisms is convincingly explained. + The main **networking activities** are well-justified and include both **internal and external activities** directly related to the project topics, with a very detailed **event plan is presented**. + The project team brings together a **complementary set of skills and experience.**	- Networking activities **are not sufficiently justified** in relation to the contribution of the partner x. - The main networking activities and knowledge transfer contributing to the research and innovation activities **are generic.** - The compatibility between participants **contributions and skills** is **insufficiently highlighted** in the proposal. - The proposers have **not sufficiently justified** the **networking activities** concerning the **involved staff members.**

Impact



2.1.

- ✓ developing research collaborations
- ✓ transfer of knowledge
- ✓ improving R&I potential

2.2.

- ✓ enhancing the career perspectives
- ✓ skills development

2.3.

- ✓ planning of dissemination, exploitation and communication activities
- ✓ strategy for the management of intellectual property

2.4.

- ✓ scientific impacts
- ✓ economic/technological impacts
- ✓ societal impacts

Weighting – 30%

Impact

2.1.Developing new and lasting research collaborations (1), achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global level

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ There are already **well-established collaborations** between some partners. **Adding new partners** based on new ideas to the team will lead to the **development of a sustainable and lasting research collaboration**. + Previous collaborations and their nature are adequately illustrated and relevant common areas are identified to **foster cooperation beyond the duration of the project**. + The proposal **details sufficiently how secondments and resulting activities** are likely to **develop sustainable collaborations between the participants** involved.	- It is **not openly and clearly discussed** if the scope of the proposal will continue to strengthen the research collaboration among the partners **in the longer term**. - Despite previous collaborations between the partners, the measures to maintain and strengthen the future collaborations **are not clearly explained**.

Impact

2.1.Developing new and lasting research collaborations (1), achieving transfer of knowledge (2) between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global level

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ **Transfer of knowledge** among participating organisations is **well presented**. + The measures to ensure the transfer of knowledge, such as **seminars** and **workshops are well addressed**. + A **well structured multidimensional** knowledge transfer and sharing activities are presented.	- The proposal **is not sufficiently detailed** in presenting how the knowledge transfer will benefit the participating organisations. - The transfer of knowledge during secondments is **insufficiently addressed**. - The proposal **fails to convincingly demonstrate** how the planned knowledge transfer activities will occur. - The description of how knowledge transfer can be achieved through reintegration mechanisms is not clear. For example, **there is little information on how the knowledge gained by early-stage or experienced researchers during secondments will be used within sending institutions.**

Impact

2.1.Developing new and lasting research collaborations (1), achieving transfer of knowledge (2) between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential (3)at the European and global level

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The proposal **will contribute significantly** to strengthening European and Global research capacities and future innovations. + Improving R&I potential at the European and global levels is **well presented**. In addition, the proposal's contributions **appropriately target European manufacturing companies** that will benefit from this innovative system. + The topic of (...) technologies **is very timely** and of **high priority for the EU**. The project has the potential to improve R&I within the EU and worldwide and this is **credibly demonstrated**.	- Contribution to European and global innovation potential is **not convincingly explained** . - The explanation of the project's potential at the European/worldwide level is not fully elaborated, and a **limited analysis is offered** of the link between the project and the research and innovation capacity. - The proposal **does not convincingly discuss** arguments to improve research and innovation potential at European and global level.

Impact

2.2. Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives of staff members and contribution to their skills development

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The proposal **clearly explains which new skills** will be acquired by staff members through their participation in the project activities. + The measures proposed in order to enhance career perspectives and skills development are properly demonstrated, providing **credible indicators in the short and long term**. + The actions planned (**inter-sectoral and interdisciplinary secondments, training, project management, mentoring**) will enhance the career perspectives of staff members. + The potential impact of the project on the researchers' career perspective is **well described**. The Early Stage Researchers will have access to very good **scientific** and **soft skills training**. The project will enhance their employability both in the **public** and **private sectors**.	- The project **does not clearly indicate what specific skills and knowledge will be acquired** by the personnel or **how this will contribute** to the realization of their potential and better **career perspectives**. - **The training plan** for soft skills, project management, leadership skills and other transferable skills **is not adequately developed**. Insufficient detail is provided in the proposal to justify how and with what kind of strategy the project will achieve its goals of realizing the potential of individuals and enhancing their career perspectives.

Impact

2.3. Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

Plan for the dissemination and exploitation activities, including communication activities

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The dissemination of the scientific results through **articles, conferences, workshops, and public discussions have been presented in detail,** and the main events have been listed. + The list of specific actions planned for communication and dissemination of the project results is **sufficiently described and covers a wide range of effective ways to reach different groups of stakeholders and the general public, e.g. through workshops, exhibitions, project websites, and conferences.** + The plan to exploit results **is sufficiently described and relevant.**	- The **different stakeholder groups and specific outreach activities** to them **have not been adequately discussed**. - As a minor shortcoming, **cross-cultural aspects of dissemination and communication are not outlined clearly** when the project is so broad (with a large variety of socio-cultural participants and audiences). - The dissemination plan **is not sufficiently detailed** and specific information concerning the approximate number and time schedule of the foreseen publications **is not adequately defined.**

Impact

2.3. Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

Strategy for the management of intellectual property, foreseen protection measures

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The IPR measures are **convincingly described**. + IPR protection strategy is planned and substantiated by the consortium partners **previous experience in IPR protection**.	- Intellectual property aspects **lack convincing details**. A **concrete plan for managing potential IP issues** within a large network, including also third countries **is missing** in the proposal. - Given the mentioning of translating/extending these results to industry, IP protection becomes significant. However, **the plan for IP protection or resolving IP conflicts is not well developed**; the authors mention that these issues will be addressed if and when they arise, but **do not define how**.

Impact

2.4. The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The proposal **justifies very clearly** its potential contribution to scientific, societal and economic impacts. + There is clear potential for this proposal to have a sustained economic and scientific impact **beyond the duration of the project**. + The nature of the scientific and technological impacts of the project's contribution are well-substantiated, and the **proposed technology has a strong potential for developing into valuable tool**. + Economic long-term impact is explained in a comprehensive manner and is expected to have a **measurable impact on agricultural industries**.	- The societal and economic benefits that will be gained from undertaking the project at the European level **are presented in too generic terms**. - The concrete economic and technical impact at the European or global level and the market potential **have not been considered in sufficient detail**. - The description of the scientific and societal impact is not convincing. **It is unclear how the project's results will make a difference in terms of impact beyond the scope and duration of the action**. - In terms of economic impact, **limited information** is provided about **how** the project results will be extended/translated to other applications/companies, and the proposal **does not clearly identify** an industrial partner that could facilitate this process.

Implementation



- ✓ **Quality and effectiveness of the work plan**
- ✓ **Assessment of risks**
- ✓ **Appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages**

- ✓ **Quality, capacity and role of each participant, including hosting arrangements**
- ✓ **Extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise**

Weighting – 20%

Implementation

3.1. Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The work plan is **consistent**, **feasible** and **credible** in its aims. + The work packages follow **a clear structure** and build on each other. The time structure is well balanced, **in line with the project objectives**, and the activities proposed are credible. + The work plan as a whole is **well balanced**, playing on the strengths and **complementarity** of the participating organisations. The work packages are dense, including several tasks, that come together nicely in the end. + The arrangement of the secondments and their duration are **credibly justified**.	- The presented work plan **fails to demonstrate** a high level of **credibility** and **feasibility**. The work plan objectives are **not consistently aligned** with the description of the work - Most of the secondments are of very short duration and the proposal **fails to convincingly demonstrate** that the planned time is sufficient to complete the assigned tasks. - It is **unclear** if all the secondments are **necessary** to achieve the expected results. - The **interdisciplinary secondments** cannot be clearly measured from the information provided.

Implementation

3.1. Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ The project **risks** have been **identified adequately** and the related mitigation measures are **plausible**. + **The tasks, the staff, and the deliverables** are **credible and feasible**. In addition, the overall timing scheme for the undertaking of tasks and secondments is well balanced. + The project schedule is well aligned with the requirements of each task and **resources are appropriately allocated**. + Project **deliverables and milestones are well defined** in all work packages.	- The list of risks is very **generic**, and the mitigation measures are not convincingly developed. - The risks related to the project management or success of the secondments and/or potential delays **have not been adequately considered**, and the mitigation of these risks **has not been explained well**. - The timeframe for some important tasks is **not clearly provided**; for example, in regards to data collection. - The time when some deliverables are due is not clear or **not well planned**

Implementation

3.2. Quality, capacity and role of each participant, including hosting arrangements and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ All members of the consortium have the **knowledge and skills** necessary to properly implement the proposed activities. + The **roles and profiles of key people** of each beneficiary and associated partner are satisfactorily presented. + The capacity of the participating organizations to support the planned activities is overall well covered, and most partner institutions have **appropriate resources and infrastructure**. + The necessary **hosting arrangements** capacity for each participants are sufficient.	- The non-academic partners provide only **partial information** on their access to infrastructure to support secondments. - The available **staff are not described appropriately** and convincingly to implement the activities linked to the different secondments. - The supervision, support, and hosting arrangements provided to the seconded researchers **have not been adequately discussed**. - The participant organisation NAME **lacks basic operational resources and capacity** to implement the action because of **inadequate number of R&I staff** compared to secondments planned (sending and hosting) and technical resources to implement the tasks mentioned in the proposal.

Implementation

3.2. Quality, capacity and role of each participant, including hosting arrangements and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

STRENGTHS:	WEAKNESSES:
+ Throughout the proposal, the experience of staff and **complementarities** of the consortium partners are identified. + The distribution of tasks is coherent with the individual experience and **participants' complementarity and compatibility** are sufficiently demonstrated. + The participants reflect a **complementary profile** with respect to the research objectives and arguments presented. + The complementarity between the involved organisations is convincingly demonstrated. It is clearly shown that all the infrastructures and capacities of all participant institutions are appropriate to achieve the envisaged results.	- The wide variety of relevant competencies in the consortium **lack sufficient details** about key competencies. - The consortium is **not well balanced** due to the high number of scientific partners relative to participating company sectors. - The complementary nature of the participants is compromised by observed **overlaps and repetitions** in assigned roles.