



STAFF EXCHANGES: IMPLEMENTATION

3. IMPLEMENTATION



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

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

3.1 QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE WORK PLAN, ASSESSMENT OF RISKS AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE EFFORT ASSIGNED TO WORK PACKAGES



- ✓ Work Packages description (table)
- ✓ List of major deliverables (table)
- ✓ Consistency and adequacy of the work plan and the activities proposed to reach the action objectives (research/innovation activities, training, transfer of knowledge, etc.).
 - Describe how the proposed secondments are necessary to implement the activities described and their duration is appropriate to achieve the objectives.
- ✓ Credibility and feasibility of the action through the activities proposed.
- ✓ Credibility and feasibility of the allocation of secondments proposed to reach the action objectives (research/innovation activities, training, transfer of knowledge, etc.).
 - Describe how the number of staff available and the staff member profiles are appropriate to implement the activities linked to the different secondments

Definition: A work package is defined as a major subdivision of the proposed action

Proposed WPs:

- 3-4 Research WPs
- Knowledge transfer /Training WP (for secondments and networking) - or integrate these into the Research WPs)
- Communication&Dissemination/ Impact WP
- Management WP

Important!

You can only allocate PMs to WPs based on secondments!

Research WPs: PMs are based on research activities carried out through secondments.

Management or Communication/Dissemination WPs: usually there are no PMs allocated to these WPs (only if there are secondments related to these WPs).

✓ Due date: The schedule should indicate the **number of months elapsed from the start of the action** (Month 1)

Table 3: Work Package description

Work Package number	"X*"	Start/end month ⁶	__/__/__				
Work Package Title	(e.g. relevant title reflecting the R&I goals, training, transfer of knowledge activities, management, communication, dissemination, etc.)						
Lead beneficiary ⁷							
Participating organisation short name**							
Total person-months per participating organisation:							
Objectives: <i>explain the main objectives of the Work Package (e.g. R&I, training, transfer of knowledge (through secondments, after secondments /through reintegration)</i>							
Description of work and role of specific beneficiaries/associated partners broken down and listed into numbered tasks including the following details: Task "X.1" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Total number of person-months allocated to secondments= " _ " :</i> • <i>Brief description of the task in terms of relevant information concerning the specific activity/goal, the leading organisation of the task, the role(s) of the participating organisation(s), the profiles of the involved staff members, etc.</i> Task "X.X" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... 							
Description of deliverables: <i>- provide a brief description of the planned deliverables that is consistent with the deliverables to be listed from all Work Packages in Table 4</i> <i>- i.e. consider consolidating the above listed tasks into a reasonable number of concrete outcomes (scientific and/or management, training and dissemination deliverables)</i>							

*Add a table for each work package with a number

**The participating organisation short name and person-months allocated to each participating organisation should be coherent with the tables in Part A of the proposal.



Deliverable: a distinct output of the action (e.g. report, document, technical diagram, software, etc.)

numbering convention: <WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>

Examples

D1.2: Data Management Plan (here 2nd deliverable of WP 1)

D2.3: Report on Project Publications

D4.1: Report on Summer School 1

Grant Agreement requires **yearly reporting** by the consortium to follow-up implementation and to process requests for payments.

Include these reports (e.g. for a 48 month-project, year 1 and 3 progress reports) as **managerial deliverables!**

A "**lead beneficiary**" must be a beneficiary (= organisation established in a Member State/ Horizon Europe Associated Country) and cannot be an associated partner

Table 4 – Deliverables list

<i>Scientific deliverables</i>						
Deliverable no. ⁸	Deliverable title	WP no.	Lead beneficiary short name ⁹	Type ¹⁰	Dissemination level ¹¹	Due date ¹²
<i>Management, training, and dissemination deliverables</i>						
Deliverable no.	Deliverable title	WP no.	Lead beneficiary short name ¹³	Type	Dissemination level	Due date

Type: *R* = Report;

ADM = Administrative (website completion, recruitment completion, etc.);

PDE = dissemination/exploitation;

OTHER = Other including coordination

Dissemination level: *PU* = Public, *CO* = Confidential, *CI* = Classified

Scientific Deliverables						
Deliverable Number	Deliverable Title	WP No.	Lead Beneficiary Short Name	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date
D5.1	Publication to disseminate the aims the project	5		PDE	PU	12/16
D3.1	Complete data set of observations and interviews	3		R	CO	12/18
D3.2	Complete transcription of interview data	3		R	CO	12/18
D3.3	Working paper from each country outlining the initial findings	3		R	CO	2/19
D4.1	Working paper analyzing teaching for social justice practices across the three countries	4		R	CO	4/19
D5.2	Submission of peer reviewed papers on practices in each country	5		PDE	PU	10/19
D5.3	Proceedings of international conferences	5		PDE	PU	4/19
D5.4	Proposal for an edited book and/or special edition of a journal	5		PDE	CO	12/19

Management, Training, and Dissemination Deliverables						
Deliverable Number	Deliverable Title	WP No.	Lead Beneficiary Short Name	Type	Dissemination Level	Due Date
D1.1	Staff exchange registration and reporting forms	1		ADM	CO	5/17
D1.2	Memorandum of understanding on long term collaboration	1		ADM	CO	5/17
D1.3	Develop a website to publish working papers	1		ADM	PU	5/17
D1.4	Ethics approval	1		ADM	CO	7/17
D1.5	Project progress report	1		ADM	CO	12/17 12/18 12/19
D2.2	Observation schedule and CIT interview schedule developed	2		Other	CO	12/17
D2.3	Completion of training and interviewers	2		Other	CO	12/17
D 4.2	Working paper describing PETE and in-service teacher education strategy	4		R	CO	6/19
D5.4	Proceedings from teacher education for social justice interventions	5		PDE	PU	12/19

Source: ANSWER ITN project



The following mandatory deliverables will have to be submitted for grants awarded under Staff Exchange:

- ✓ **mid-term meeting** organised between the participants and the granting authority;
- ✓ **progress report** submitted within 30 days after one year from the starting date of the action;
- ✓ **mobility declaration** submitted within 20 days of the secondment of each seconded staff member, and updated (if needed) via the Funding & Tenders Portal Continuous Reporting tool;
- ✓ **evaluation questionnaire** completed by the seconded staff members and submitted at the end of their secondments; a follow-up questionnaire submitted two years later;
- ✓ **data management plan** submitted at mid-term and an update towards the end of the project if needed;
- ✓ **plan for the dissemination and exploitation of results**, including communication activities submitted at mid-term and an update towards the end of the project.



- **Risk management at consortium level**

- Include a list incorporating research risks and project management risks. Describe practical mitigation and contingency plans for both.

Table 5 – Risks list

Risk no.	Description of risk	WP no.	Proposed mitigation measures
R1	e.g. delay in planned secondments		

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.

	Description of Risk	WP No	Proposed mitigation measures
R1	Members of the research exchange team (RET) leaving their institutions	WP 1-5	Emerging research will be stored on a research website. A memorandum of understanding will be signed by the research participants ensuring that intellectual property generated through [REDACTED] will remain with the research group rather than the individuals
R2	Delays in planned secondments or deliverables.	WP 1-5	Each RET is made up of a minimum of three. A minimum of two members would be required for each WP. Each RET has the capacity to second additional researchers. [REDACTED] has in place a process by which the progress of deliverables will be monitored throughout the project.
R3	Partner withdrawal	WP 1-5	All institutions and partners have ensured their participation in the project. All institutions have got endorsement from their faculties and their universities.
R4	Problems with creation of effective communication system	WP1 1-5	The project is depending on effective communication system. Each home institution has IT-support that ensure that the university's IT-service run smoothly and match the requirements of the project.
R5	Problems with dissemination	WP5	The dissemination activities will effectively be monitored through all the different networks each institution are engaged in and through different national and international channels in the field.

Additional risks

- Delay due to partner(s) failing to meet important deadlines
- Incapacity of the Project Coordinator
- Incapacity of one of the partners

- **Environmental aspects** in light of the MSCA Green Charter
 - The MSCA Green Charter promotes the sustainable implementation of research activities - in line with the goals of the European Green Deal
 - The sustainable implementation of your research project starts at the planning stage and continues throughout the lifetime of the project.
 - The goal of the MSCA Green Charter is to encourage sustainable thinking in research management.
 - The MSCA Green Charter is a code of good practice for individuals and institutions who are in receipt of MSCA funding.
 - All participants are expected to adhere to the Green Charter on a "best effort" basis and to commit to as many of its provisions as possible during the implementation of their projects.

Some measures individuals and institutions are invited to consider are to:

- reduce, reuse and recycle
- promote green purchasing for project-related materials
- ensure the sustainability of project events
- use low-emission forms of transport
- promote teleconferencing whenever possible
- use sustainable and renewable forms of energy
- develop awareness on environmental sustainability
- share ideas and examples of best practice



- + The work plan is **clearly structured** and appropriate, activities are credible and **linkages** between work packages are well addressed.
- + The work plan is overall coherent with credible tasks and deliverables, thereby supporting the **feasibility** of the research.
- + The activities proposed are **concrete** and credible, and their feasibility is sufficiently demonstrated.
- + The work plan, linked secondments and how those secondments support the tasks and deliverables are coherent, **explained thoroughly** and clearly demonstrate feasibility.
- + The work package descriptions are sufficiently **detailed** and the allocation of tasks and resources is appropriate with **clearly defined deliverables**.
- + Very professional risk assessment is included in the proposal, and **realistic solutions** are provided.

- The **role** of every partner in each work package is not evident. The work packages and task leaders (persons in charge) are not clearly specified.
- The distribution of the secondments (person-months) is **unbalanced** with some partners assigned a high number of secondments without convincing justification.
- The number and timeliness of the **deliverables** are not sufficiently discussed. The list of deliverables does not include tangible outputs, beyond minutes, plans, reports and data
- The reason for the non-academic partner to only receive secondments, but not make secondments is not sufficiently explained.
- The risk management and contingency plans **lack detail or are missing**. Personal, and technical risks and associated contingency actions are not adequately identified. IPR issues are not properly addressed. Please note: It is not realistic to classify all the risks associated with the project as low risk.

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



- **Appropriateness of the infrastructure and capacity of each participating organisation**, as outlined in Section 4 (Participating Organisations), in light of the tasks allocated to them in the action;
- Consortium composition and exploitation of **participating organisations' complementarities**: explain the compatibility and coherence between the tasks attributed to each beneficiary/associated partner in the action, including in light of their experience;
- Commitment of beneficiaries and associated partners to the programme.
 - The role of associated partners and their active contribution to the research and training activities should be described.
 - A letter of commitment shall also be provided in section 5 and must follow the template (included within the PDF file, but outside the page limit).



- + All the participants present adequate staff member profiles and an appropriate number of available staff for the successful implementation of the project.
- + The competencies and experience of those involved is clearly presented and consistent with the aims and objectives of the project.
- + All the participants have the appropriate facilities to carry out the work and to host seconded participants.
- + The necessary infrastructures and major items of technical equipment relevant to the proposed programme are well described.
- + The composition of the consortium is excellent in terms of choice of partners, regional spread and expertise, with a clear demonstration of partners' commitment to the project. The partners' contribution for the achievement of the project's objectives is well identified and their complementarity is fully demonstrated.
- + The synergies and complementarities of participants cover all scientific and technological aspects of the proposed work.

- The appropriateness of the institutional infrastructure has been insufficiently addressed.
- The infrastructures of some non-academic participants are only briefly described. Some necessary equipment is not fully described.
- The allocation of human resources is not sufficiently justified for some non-academic participants.
- It is not sufficiently demonstrated that the participating organisations possess a sufficient breadth of expertise to achieve all of the scientific objectives.
- The relevant infrastructures for some of the participants are insufficiently described. This aspect negatively impacts the feasibility of the project.
- Competences and experiences of the non-academic partner have not been specified in sufficient detail.
- The complementarity of the different partners is not sufficiently detailed.
- The proposal does not illustrate sufficiently the precise skill sets and inputs from the non-academic partners.

Challenges in implementation of MSCA Staff Exchanges project

MSCA-NET

Have in mind
this while
preparing
project
proposal!

How to find partners for
the consortium?

How to involve non-
academic partners
(especially SME without
R&D departments) in a
project?

What is the optimum
partner number (sector
balance, ESR/ER
balance)?

How to motivate
employers to join a
MSCA SE project?

Help in the project
application!

Grant Agreement”, but
also a „Consortium
Agreement” has to be
signed that can set
different financial rules.

Changing the status of
non-academic to
academic status.

If there is no mobility,
there is no budget for
partners –it is important
to start!

It is hard to find PhD
candidates that are full
time employed at their
institution, but are not
already bound to other
projects.

Organisation of the
accommodation during
the secondment.



MSCA SE RESOURCES FROM MSCA-NET

MSCA SE RESOURCES FROM REA



MSCA-NET has received funding from the European Union's Research and Innovation Program Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No 101054477