




REPUBLIKA SLOVENIJA  
MINISTRSTVO ZA IZOBRAŽEVANJE,  
ZNANOST IN ŠPORT

illustration: © European Union, 2021 — image source: iStockphoto.com



**MSCA**  
Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions  
*Developing talents, advancing research*

# POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

**Dr. Stojan Sorčan**, NCP MSCA, MIZŠ

Ljubljana, 25. maj 2022,



# The MSCA under Horizon Europe



## Pillar 1 Excellent Science

European Research Council

Marie Skłodowska-Curie  
Actions

Research Infrastructures



## Pillar 2 Global Challenges and European Industrial Competitiveness

### Clusters

- Health
- Culture, Creativity and Inclusive Society
- Civil Security for Society
- Digital, Industry and Space
- Climate, Energy and Mobility
- Food, Bioeconomy, Natural Resources, Agriculture and Environment

Joint Research Centre



## Pillar 3 Innovative Europe

European Innovation Council


European innovation  
ecosystems

European Institute of Innovation  
and Technology

## Widening Participation and Strengthening the European Research Area

Widening participation and spreading excellence

Reforming and Enhancing the European R&I system



© European Union, 2022 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)  
Source: iStockphoto.com

# CALL 2022

## Postdoctoral Fellowships

opening:

**12•05•2022**

closing:

**14•09•2022**

budget:

**€257 million**



## MSCA

Marie Skłodowska-Curie **Actions**  
*Developing talents, advancing research*



# CALL 2021 RESULTS

## Postdoctoral Fellowships


Selected proposals:

**1156**

Budget:

**€242**

million



**MSCA**

Marie Skłodowska-Curie **Actions**  
*Developing talents, advancing research*

Submitted proposals:

**8356**

Host organisations in:

**46** countries



SEARCH FUNDING &amp; TENDERS

HOW TO PARTICIPATE

PROJECTS &amp; RESULTS

WORK AS AN EXPERT

SUPPORT



• Data management of the organizations, search functions under the 'My organisations' tab and adding new organizations to proposals may not be available **today, Thursday, 21/04/2022 from 17:00 to 17:30 (CET)**, while technical maintenance is being performed. We apologize for the inconvenience caused.

## MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2022

TOPIC ID: HORIZON-MSCA-2022-PF-01-01

Grant

### General information

Topic description

Destination

Conditions and documents

Partner search announcements

Submission service

Topic related FAQ

Get support

Call updates

### General information

Programme

[Horizon Europe Framework Programme \(HORIZON\)](#)

Call

[MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2022 \(HORIZON-MSCA-2022-PF-01\)](#) See budget overview

Type of action

HORIZON-TMA-MSCA-PF-EF HORIZON TMA MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships - European Fellowships

Type of MGA

HORIZON Unit Grant [HORIZON-AG-UN]

Forthcoming

HORIZON-TMA-MSCA-PF-GF HORIZON TMA MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships - Global Fellowships

HORIZON Unit Grant [HORIZON-AG-UN]

Deadline model

single-stage

Planned opening date

13 April 2022

Deadline date

14 September 2022 17:00:00 Brussels time

## Partner search announcements

Searches of partners to collaborate on this topic

**69**

[View / Edit](#)

LEARs, Account Administrators or self-registrants can publish partner requests for open and forthcoming topics after logging into this Portal, as well as any user having an active public Person profile.

## Start submission

The submission system is planned to be opened on the date stated on the topic header.

### Topic related FAQ

 Search...  
Q

#### Under Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowships (MSCA-PF), may a supervisor have multiple fellows awarded with Postdoctoral Fellowships?

For MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships, the Supervisor may supervise two or more fellows, as long as the obligations of the beneficiary institution stipulated in the HE Model Grant Agree...

#### Under Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowships (MSCA-PF), if the researcher's family status changes during the project, can a family allowance be granted and the maximum EU contribution increased?

Under Horizon Europe, if the recruited researcher acquires family obligations during the implementation of the project (marriage, or relationship with equivalent status, or dependent...

#### Under Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowships (MSCA-PF), are there equivalence criteria for doctoral degrees in terms of eligibility (for example medical research)?

Applicants who have successfully defended their doctoral thesis on or before the call deadline but who have not yet formally been awarded the doctoral degree will also be considered ...

#### Under Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowships (MSCA-PF), will stays for medical reasons be taken into account for the mobility rule?

... for medical reasons. Short stays for medical reasons will not be taken into account for the assessment of the mobility rule. However, if the...

# How to apply?



## Funding & tender opportunities

Single Electronic Data Interchange Area (SEDIA)



### Part A (structured data)

A screenshot of a web-based application interface for submitting structured data. It shows a form with several sections: "General information", "Participants & contacts", "Budget" (with a yellow "new" badge), "Ethics", and "Call-specific questions". Below the form is a "Table of contents" section. At the bottom, there is a note about the "Data Protection Act".

### Part B (description of action)



**10 page  
limit**



**EN**

## **Horizon Europe**

### **Work Programme 2021-2022**

#### *2. Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions*

*(European Commission Decision C(2021)4200 of 15 June 2021)*

## Table of contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>MSCA Doctoral Networks: .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Call - MSCA Doctoral Networks 2021 .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	12
HORIZON-MSCA-2021-DN-01-01: MSCA Doctoral Networks 2021 .....	13
<b>Call - MSCA Doctoral Networks 2022 .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	16
HORIZON-MSCA-2022-DN-01-01: MSCA Doctoral Networks 2022 .....	17
<b>MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships: .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Call - MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2021 .....</b>	<b>22</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	22
HORIZON-MSCA-2021-PF-01-01: MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2021 .....	23
<b>Call - MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2022 .....</b>	<b>26</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	26
HORIZON-MSCA-2022-PF-01-01: MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships 2022 .....	27
<b>MSCA Staff Exchanges: .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Call - MSCA Staff Exchanges 2021 .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	32
HORIZON-MSCA-2021-SE-01-01: MSCA Staff Exchanges 2021 .....	33
<b>Call - MSCA Staff Exchanges 2022 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Conditions for the Call .....	35
HORIZON-MSCA-2022-SE-01-01: MSCA Staff Exchanges 2022 .....	36
<b>MSCA Co-funding of regional, national and international programmes: .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>1.1. Applicable unit contributions .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>1.2. Admissibility .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>1.3. Eligibility .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>1.4. Award criteria .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>1.5. Procedure .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>1.6. Legal and financial set-up of the Grant Agreements .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>2. MSCA POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>2.1. Applicable unit contributions .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>2.2. Admissibility .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>2.3. Eligibility .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>2.4. Award criteria .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>2.5. Procedure .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>2.6. Legal and Financial set-up of the Grant Agreements .....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>3. MSCA STAFF EXCHANGES .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>3.1. Applicable unit contributions .....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>3.2. Admissibility .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>3.3. Eligibility .....</b>	<b>91</b>



## **Horizon Europe Programme**

**Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions**  
**Postdoctoral Fellowships (HE MSCA PF)**

Application form (Part A)  
Project proposal – Technical description (Part B)

Version 2.0  
6 May 2022

S. Sorčan, NCP MSCA Slovenia, 2022





## Horizon Europe Programme

### Guide for Applicants

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions – Postdoctoral Fellowships (PF)

Version 1.1 - 2022

11/05/2022

#### Disclaimer

This guide aims to support potential applicants to the PF 2022 call. It is provided for information purposes only and is not intended to replace consultation of any applicable legal sources. Neither the European Commission nor the European Research Executive Agency (or any person acting on their behalf) can be held responsible for the use made of this guidance document. Note that the guidance provided in the Annotated Model Grant Agreement shall prevail in case of discrepancies.

S. Sorčan, NCP **MSCA** Slovenia, 2022


# Introduction to the MSCA

EU's reference programme for doctoral and postdoctoral training, contributing to:

- A highly skilled research-based human capital able to detect and tackle upcoming challenges, communicate scientific evidence to policy-makers and the public, and work across disciplines
- Provide researchers with skills needed in the labour market, to innovate and to convert knowledge and ideas into products and services for economic and social benefit
- Develop excellent doctoral programmes enhancing the global attractiveness and visibility of institutions involved in them
- Promote the EU's global attractiveness for talents

Budget under Horizon Europe: **6.6€ billion**

# Introduction to MSCA: Key features



- MSCA budget under Horizon Europe: **6,6B€**
- **Excellent Science (Pillar 1):** reinforcing and extending the excellence of the EU's science base
- **Worldwide geographic coverage**

# MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships

**Mono-beneficiary action** to support postdoctoral research and careers

## Main Objectives

- **Foster excellence** through implementation of research project
- Enhance the **creative and innovative potential** of researchers holding a PhD (training on transferable skills & career development)
- Focus on **I3** (international, inter-sectoral, interdisciplinary) mobility
- Bridges and **exposure to the non-academic sector**

# MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships: Features

## Duration

- **European Fellowships:** 12-24 months
- **Global Fellowships:** 24-36 months (12-24 outgoing phase & 12 months mandatory return phase in Europe)

## Optional schemes

- **Secondments worldwide** up to 1/3 of the fellowship duration—  
**(novelty:** worldwide secondments)
- Optional **additional placement of up to 6 months** in a non-academic European organization (**novelty**) at the end of the fellowship applicable to both European and Global PF
- **Widening activities:** “ERA Fellowships” will be aligned with the MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships call

## Next call

- 2022 [indicative]: 12 May – 14 Sept; 257 M€  
[+indicative EUR 1 million for Euratom]

S. Šorčan, NCP MSCA Slovenia, 2022




# ERA Fellowships

- Widening activities: “**ERA Fellowships**”
- **No separate application or evaluation** – integral part of the MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships call application form
  - For specific countries – available in Work Programme
  - Only for European Fellowships, Global Fellowships do not qualify
  - **Attention:** “call specific question” to be completed in the PF submission for EF to indicate willingness to participate in this call (only if host organisation is a qualifying country)
  - Only proposals scoring over 70% in the PF call will be considered
  - Timing aligned with PF call

# ERA Fellowships 2021 call

## Grants for 'Widening' countries under MSCA-PF and ERA-PF call 2021



\*\*ES (represented here not as outermost region 'Canary Islands')

# MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships

---

- **Who applies? Participating Organisations\* :**
  - Legal entity in an EU Member State or HE Associated country
- **Recruited Researchers- Target Groups:**
  - any nationality (Global Fellowships: nationals or long-term residents of MS or HE AC) \*
  - in possession of PhD at the call deadline – **novelty**
  - up to 8 years research experience after PhD (with exceptions= career breaks, work outside research, research outside Europe for reintegrating researchers) – **novelty**
  - mobility rule: not resided /main activity in the country of the beneficiary (or host organization for GF) more than 12 in the 36 months before call deadline
- **\*Specific eligibility criteria for PFs supported by Euratom:**
  - Organisation: legal entity established in an EU Member State or Euratom AC
  - Researcher: nationals or long-term residents of an EU Member State or a Euratom AC

# MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships

## Contributions for recruited researchers

Per person-month

Living  
allowance

Mobility  
allowance

Family  
allowance  
(if applicable)

Long-term  
leave  
allowance  
(if applicable)

Special  
needs  
allowance  
(if applicable)

Research,  
training and  
networking  
contribution

Management  
and indirect  
contribution

EUR 5 080

EUR 600

EUR 660

EUR 5 680  
x  
% covered  
by the  
beneficiary

Requested  
unit<sup>1</sup>  
x  
(1/number of  
months)

EUR 1 000


EUR 650

## Institutional unit contributions

Per person-month

A country correction coefficient applies to the living allowance in order to ensure equal treatment and purchasing power parity for all researchers. Slo = 83,3%

## Overview of Evaluation Process



**MSCA-IF-2020: Cumulative percentage of proposals above threshold, with a given score or higher (funding range marked in green)**

Number of eligible proposals	632 proposals	707 proposals	230 proposals	1230 proposals	175 proposals	1188 proposals	1052 proposals	1929 proposals	194 proposals	993 proposals	2105 proposals	62 proposals	16 proposals	109 proposals	144 proposals	137 proposals	12 proposals	71 proposals	396 proposals
Cut off score for funding*	90,0	92,4	88,6	93,0	95,0	94,0	93,6	94,4	93,8	92,4	93,4	90,2	93,0	92,2	91,8	90,8	93,8	92,6	90,4
Score equal to or above	CAR	RI	SE	ST-CHE	ST-ECO	ST-ENG	ST-ENV	ST-LIF	ST-MAT	ST-PHY	ST-SOC	GF-CHE	GF-ECO	GF-ENV	GF-LIF	GF-MAT	GF-PHY	GF-SOC	
100	0,00%	0,14%	0,43%	0,16%	0,57%	0,25%	0,29%	0,41%	0,00%	0,00%	0,29%	0,00%	1,83%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,25%	
99	0,16%	1,13%	1,30%	0,24%	1,14%	0,76%	1,05%	0,98%	0,00%	0,30%	0,95%	1,61%	6,25%	1,83%	1,39%	2,19%	0,00%	0,00%	
98	1,11%	3,68%	2,61%	1,46%	4,00%	1,68%	2,00%	3,47%	1,55%	1,51%	2,85%	3,23%	12,50%	6,42%	2,08%	5,11%	0,00%	2,82%	1,77%
97	2,53%	5,09%	3,04%	2,93%	6,86%	2,95%													
96	4,43%	8,06%	6,52%	4,55%	9,14%	5,64%													
95	6,01%	12,31%	8,70%	7,56%	13,14%	9,60%													
94	7,91%	15,84%	10,43%	9,76%	13,71%	12,37%													
93	9,81%	18,10%	13,04%	12,44%	14,86%	15,07%													
92	13,13%	21,78%	15,65%	15,12%	18,86%	17,76%													
91	16,61%	26,03%	18,26%	18,94%	20,57%	21,97%													
90	18,83%	30,27%	20,87%	22,85%	22,86%	25,59%													
89	22,15%	33,95%	21,30%	25,85%	27,43%	28,96%													
88	24,05%	39,32%	24,78%	30,33%	29,14%	32,07%													
87	26,42%	43,00%	26,96%	33,74%	30,86%	35,52%													
86	29,43%	47,52%	28,70%	37,32%	32,00%	38,05%													
85	31,65%	51,06%	30,87%	40,16%	34,29%	41,33%	41,06%	41,01%	40,72%	42,30%	35,63%	50,00%	37,50%	49,54%	51,39%	48,18%	50,00%	50,70%	38,64%
84	34,49%	54,88%	33,91%	43,82%	36,57%	44,53%	46,20%	44,69%	46,39%	45,12%	38,24%	54,84%	37,50%	53,21%	53,47%	48,91%	50,00%	53,52%	41,16%
83	36,39%	57,14%	36,09%	46,50%	37,14%	46,97%	50,29%	49,20%	48,97%	49,75%	41,09%	58,06%	43,75%	55,05%	56,94%	49,64%	50,00%	57,75%	42,68%
82	39,87%	60,68%	39,57%	50,89%	39,43%	50,17%	53,71%	52,20%	52,06%	52,87%	44,23%	62,90%	56,25%	55,96%	63,19%	51,82%	58,33%	59,15%	44,95%
81	42,56%	63,51%	43,91%	55,04%	40,57%	52,53%	56,46%	55,05%	60,31%	55,99%	46,51%	66,13%	56,25%	58,72%	65,97%	57,66%	66,67%	61,97%	48,48%
80	44,94%	66,34%	47,83%	58,54%	42,29%	56,06%	60,27%	57,80%	61,86%	59,52%	49,12%	70,97%	56,25%	61,47%	68,06%	62,04%	66,67%	63,38%	51,26%
79	48,10%	69,17%	51,74%	61,54%	44,57%	58,25%	63,31%	60,86%	65,46%	63,34%	51,59%	74,19%	56,25%	65,14%	68,75%	65,69%	66,67%	64,79%	53,28%
78	50,63%	70,86%	56,09%	64,63%	50,86%	60,69%	65,49%	63,56%	68,04%	65,76%	54,25%	79,03%	56,25%	66,97%	70,83%	68,61%	66,67%	71,83%	55,56%
77	53,48%	73,27%	57,83%	67,40%	52,57%	62,79%	67,59%	66,51%	69,07%	67,98%	57,01%	83,87%	56,25%	68,81%	75,00%	70,80%	75,00%	74,65%	57,83%
76	56,65%	76,10%	60,43%	70,16%	54,29%	65,32%	70,06%	69,26%	71,13%	71,20%	59,57%	87,10%	56,25%	70,64%	77,78%	72,99%	75,00%	80,28%	60,10%
75	59,34%	77,37%	63,04%	72,44%	56,00%	67,42%	71,58%	71,59%	73,20%	75,23%	62,14%	88,71%	56,25%	75,23%	80,56%	73,72%	75,00%	80,28%	62,88%
74	61,55%	78,78%	64,78%	74,07%	58,86%	69,78%	74,05%	73,77%	74,74%	77,14%	63,71%	90,32%	56,25%	77,06%	82,64%	75,91%	83,33%	81,69%	64,65%
73	63,29%	81,47%	68,26%	76,02%	60,00%	71,30%	75,95%	75,48%	77,84%	79,15%	65,84%	91,94%	62,50%	79,82%	83,33%	76,64%	83,33%	83,10%	67,17%
72	65,82%	82,89%	68,70%	78,70%	63,43%	73,06%	77,66%	77,66%	78,87%	79,96%	67,51%	91,94%	68,75%	79,82%	83,33%	78,83%	91,67%	83,10%	69,95%
71	67,88%	83,59%	70,87%	80,73%	65,14%	74,58%	79,75%	79,52%	79,90%	81,77%	69,83%	93,55%	75,00%	82,57%	84,72%	78,83%	91,67%	84,51%	71,97%
70	69,94%	85,01%	72,61%	82,60%	66,86%	76,01%	80,99%	81,44%	82,47%	84,79%	71,59%	93,55%	75,00%	84,40%	85,42%	81,02%	91,67%	85,92%	72,73%



Percentage of proposals below threshold (<70)	30,06%	14,99%	27,39%	17,40%	33,14%	23,99%	19,01%	18,56%	17,53%	15,21%	28,41%	6,45%	25,00%	15,60%	14,58%	18,98%	8,33%	14,08%	27,27%
																		21	



**≥ 85 %**

## What is the Seal of Excellence?

---

The Seal of Excellence is a quality label awarded to project proposals submitted to Horizon 2020, the EU's research and innovation funding programme, to help these proposals find alternative funding.

Projects which were judged to deserve funding but did not get it due to budget limits receive the Seal of Excellence.

It recognises the value of the proposal and helps other funding bodies take advantage of the Horizon 2020 evaluation process.

It is awarded to proposals which applied under

- [SME Instrument](#)
- [Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions \(MSCA\) individual fellowships](#)
- [Teaming](#)

# MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships

Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation <u>objectives</u> (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)	Credibility of the measures to enhance the <u>career perspectives</u> and <u>employability</u> of the researcher and contribution to his/her skills development	Quality and effectiveness of the <u>work plan</u> , assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages
<b>Soundness of the proposed methodology</b> (including interdisciplinary approaches, 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 <u>expected outcomes and impacts</u> , as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities	Quality and capacity of the <u>host institutions and participating organisations</u> , including hosting arrangements
Quality of the <u>supervision</u> , training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host	The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the <u>expected scientific, societal and economic impacts</u>	
Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's <u>professional experience</u> , competences and skills		
50%	30%	20%

----- Start of page count (max 10 pages) -----

### Part B-1

#### 1. 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)**

At a minimum, address the following aspects:

- Describe the quality and pertinence of the R&I objectives; are the objectives measurable and verifiable? Are they realistically achievable?
- Describe how your project goes beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious.

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

At a minimum, address the following aspects:

- Overall methodology: 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. Refer to any important challenges you may have identified in the chosen methodology and how you intend to overcome them.

- Integration of methods and disciplines to pursue the objectives: Explain how expertise and methods from different disciplines will be brought together and integrated in pursuit of your objectives. If you consider that an inter-disciplinary<sup>2</sup> approach is unnecessary in the context of the proposed work, please provide a justification.

- Gender dimension and other diversity aspects: Describe how the gender dimension and other diversity aspects are taken into account in the project's research and innovation content. If you do not consider such a gender dimension to be relevant in your project, please provide a justification.

 Remember that that this question relates to the content of the planned research and innovation activities, and not to gender balance in the teams in charge of carrying out the project.

 Sex, gender and diversity analysis refers to biological characteristics and social/cultural factors respectively. For guidance on methods of sex / gender analysis and the issues to be taken into account, please refer to [this page](#).

- Open science practices: Describe how appropriate open science practices are implemented as an integral part of the proposed methodology. Show how the choice of practices and their implementation is adapted to the nature of your work in a way


<sup>2</sup> Interdisciplinarity means the integration of information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts or theories from two or more scientific disciplines.

# PF 2021 call

## Proposals retained for funding - EF

Action	Eligible proposals	Main list
PF-EF	7439	1025
Grand total	8247	1156

Panel	Success rate EF
CHE	13,94%
ECO	13,82%
ENG	13,59%
ENV	13,73%
LIF	13,76%
MAT	14,11%
PHY	14,05%
SOC	13,67%
Grand Total	13,78%




## MSCA KEYWORDS

Scientific panel	Level 1 keywords	Level 2 keywords
Chemistry (CHE)	C1-Inorganic Chemistry	Catalysis Coordination chemistry Inorganic and nuclear chemistry NMP Non-Metallic Materials & basic processes Organometallic chemistry Radiation and nuclear chemistry
	C2-Organic, Polymer and Molecular Chemistry	Carbohydrates Combinatorial chemistry Heterocyclic chemistry Macromolecular chemistry Molecular architecture and structure Molecular biology Molecular chemistry Natural product synthesis Organic chemistry Organic reaction mechanism Peptide chemistry Polymer chemistry Stereochemistry Supramolecular chemistry Synthetic Organic chemistry
	C3-Physical and Analytical Chemistry	Analytical chemistry Chemical instrumentation Chemical reactions: mechanisms, dynamics, kinetics and catalytic reactions Chemistry of condensed matter Chromatography Colloid chemistry Corrosion Crystallography and X-ray diffraction Electrochemistry, electrodialysis, microfluidics, sensors Forensic chemistry Heterogeneous catalysis Homogeneous catalysis Ionic liquids Mass Spectrometry Method development in chemistry

# What are the main challenges for applicants? - 1

## 1. Excellence :

- Clarity and pertinance of the **objectives**
- Soundness of the **concept**
- Credibility of the proposed **methodology**
- Extent that the proposal is beyond the **state-of-the-art**
- Demonstration of the **innovative** potential
- Appropriate consideration of the **interdisciplinary** approach
- Two-way **transfer of knowledge**
- **Training** activities





# OBJECTIVES

- The project is **operationalised** by clear and integrated objectives.
- The overarching aim is highly relevant and original, SO are **clearly defined and relevant**.
- The objectives are in **relation to the SOA**.
- The theoretical basis is supported by a sufficient number of **bibliographical references**.
- The concepts are supported by pertinent **citations**.
- Project objectives are **clear, concise and achievable**.
- Clearly defined objectives, both in terms of **specific outcomes, learning goals and training objectives**.
- The objectives are **ambitious**.
- RO's should correspond to the **research work package** (O1 is the objective for WP1)



# Weaknesses: objectives

- The **research objectives** are not described with a sufficient level of detail.
- The **research objectives** of the proposal are not clearly outlined and not sufficiently sustained by suitable measurable indicators.



# "STATE OF THE ART"

- Outline the current **level of knowledge**
- Break the SOA into separate short paragraphs focused to a **specific objective**
- References to the **theoretical framework** and previous related research
- A comprehensive **literature review** related to the field of study is included.
- Mention your **supervisor** and **your references** in the current SOA
- Describe existing **knowledge gaps**
- The **open questions** in the SOA are well summarized.
- The research offers **original inputs** that will enrich the SOA
- Progress „**beyond the current SOA**“

# Weaknesses: state-of-the art

- There is **inadequate description** of the state-of-the-art concerning the use of xxx
- Some elements of the **working hypothesis**, such as the linkage between XXXX are not supported by the state-of-the-art knowledge in a sufficiently **clear and convincing way**.
- The proposal is not fully **clear how and to what extent** it could foster knowledge **beyond** the state of the art of the relevant research field.
- The way the research goes **beyond the state-of-the-art** is not sufficiently **presented**.



# Level of novelty – originality

- **Innovative potential** in terms of objectives and methodologies applied to a topic.
- Use of equipment, technique, method, knowledge in novel way.
- **New** analysis, concept, method that will be implemented.
- The combination of **several approaches**.
- It will contribute to **advance the SOA**.
- The outcome of the project is **truly novel**.
- Clear contribution to a range of **inter-related fields**.
- Ambitious to create new knowledge that have potential to **impact** applied areas.

# Weaknesses: novelty, innovation

- The novelty and relevance of proposal's research objectives are **limited** and it has not been **clearly presented** how the results can contribute to **advance the state-of-the-art**
- The novelty of the proposed research is not sufficiently **justified**. The main idea has been **previously explored in recent literature**.
- The novelty of the proposal is insufficiently **demonstrated**, and the level of innovative approach to the problem is **low**.



# Research methodology

- The RM is explained **for each objective** and justified in relation to the overall project objectives.
- The RM and the proposed approach are very well summarized and detailed, with concrete plans on **how to tackle** the proposed problems.
- The RM is very well formulated, is **up-to-date** and innovative.
- The RM explain **why** the approach has been chosen.
- For each method/steps described put in brackets the **research work pacakge**.



# **Weaknesses: methodology**

- - **Novelty and innovative aspects** of the research methodology, particularly ....is not convincing **to reach the objectives** of the fellowship.
- - The specific methodological steps and **comparison with other** possible models are not sufficiently well discussed.
- The methodology lacks **fundamental information**
- **Critical information** is missing so that the methods are fully convincing.
- Some methodological aspects XXXX are not **properly elaborated** in the proposal.
- The proposed methodology is not well **explained** and it is not sound enough.
- Some **methodological** aspects are not clearly described



# Interdisciplinarity

- The project addresses **different fields of research**.
- The explanation of the interdisciplinarity is sufficiently **detailed**.
- The multidisciplinary nature of the project **is evident**.

# Weaknesses: interdisciplinarity

- The claimed interdisciplinary aspects of the research activities are not **convincingly explained**.
- Interdisciplinarity is not described in a way which is convincing and, as it stands, the **results of it are not credible** and, furthermore, **not fully exploited** in the proposed actions.
- Interdisciplinary aspects of the proposal **are not adequately addressed**.

# Open Science in Horizon Europe

**“Open science” means *an approach* to the scientific process based on open cooperative work, tools and diffusing knowledge**

(Horizon Europe Regulation and Model Grant Agreement)

*The concepts of **Open Science**, Open Innovation, Open to the World should ensure **excellence and impact** of the Union’s investment in research and innovation, while safeguarding the Union’s interests*

(Recital 7 Horizon Europe Regulation)

# Open science


- Relevant details are provided concerning the open science practices, such as data categories to be stored and the open repositories to enable accessibility of the data to the scientific community and the public. (CHE)
- Open science practices are adequately provisioned in the proposal, properly considering also the involvement of end users in order to test and analyze the data. (ENG)
- The open science practices and data management plan are very good, including an initiative to leverage potential public interest in ice caves as well as the use of community numerical models and open publishing of cave data. (ENV)
- Open science practices are well suited to share the algorithms developed in open source projects. (PHY)

# Weaknesses: open science

- Open science practices are **insufficiently discussed** in the proposal.
- The description of open science practices is not totally **clear** on how and whether the raw experimental data and methodologies will be made available.
- Open science practices and a needed data management plan **are not effectively outlined**.

# How the researcher will receive knowledge at the host? - 1

- Mutual **knowledge transfer** is clearly demonstrated.
- There is a good **complementarity** between the expertise of the host and the researcher.
- The **mechanisms** for the two-way knowledge transfer are described.
- A **Career Development Plan** will be part of the action's implementation in line with the EU C+C .
- The planned **training program** is effective and provides well-described **measures**.
- The measures **to integrate** the researcher in the team are well planned.
- It describes adequately and in detail all the **scientific and non-scientific knowledge and skills** that researcher will receive from host institution and specifies the **training activities**.
- Various **extra-/intra-institutional activites** including regular meetings and coaching strategies as well as specific hosting arrangements for the researcher are planned.



# How the researcher will receive knowledge at the host? - 2

- The TA are carefully prepared and are highly **relevant for the researcher**.
- The TA will **complement the profile** of the researcher.
- The **training objectives** are explicitly specified.
- **Inter-sectoral or interdisciplinary** transfer of knowledge (e.g. through secondments).
- Participation in the **research and financial management** of the action.
- Organisation of **scientific/training/dissemination** events.
- **Communication**, outreach activities and horizontal skills.
- Training dedicated to **gender** issues.
- **Carrier training** as well as trainings in **writing proposals** for EU programs.

# Weaknesses: training

- The training aspects are not presented in **sufficient details**.
- The description of the training activities for the researcher lacks crucial **details**, so that the planning is not **credible** in relation to the extent and type of research that is proposed.
- It is not clearly established how some of the **seminars and workshops** the researcher will attend will benefit the proposed research work.



# TOK to the host from the researcher

- How **you will enrich the host** and its students?
- The proposal includes the delivery of two one-week courses for the students.
- Describe **knowledge/skills** that could be applied to research in host.
- Knowledge to address **current gaps in the host.**
- **Existing collaborations/networks** that you have from your past work.
- The **skills of the researcher** and their previous collaborations will be useful for the host group.

# Weaknesses: the two way transfer of knowledge

- The two way transfer of knowledge is not **fully described**.
- There are no clear **activities to organize** the transfer of knowledge and experience from the researcher to the host beyond the day-to-day experimental work.
- The transfer knowledge from researcher to host **would be limited** as the host group **is already familiar** with the researcher's area of expertise.
- It is **not clear** to what extent the host already has some of the expertise that the researcher brings

# Gender and other diversity aspects



**Eligibility: Gender Equality Plan**



**Award Criteria:** Integration of the gender dimension



**Ranking Criteria:** Gender balance



# Integration of the gender dimension in R&I content

## Gender Dimension

**Addressing the gender dimension in research and innovation content entails taking into account sex and gender in the whole research & innovation process (already in H2020 MSCA)**

- Why is the gender dimension important?
- Why do we observe differences between women and men in infection levels and mortality rates in the COVID-19 pandemic?
- Does it make sense to study cardiovascular diseases only on male animals and on men, or osteoporosis only on women?
- Does it make sense to design car safety equipment only on the basis of male body standards?
- Is it ethical to develop AI products that spread gender and racial biases due to a lack of diversity in the data used in training AI applications?
- Is it normal that household travel surveys, and thus mobility analysis and transport planning, underrate trips performed as part of caring work, which are predominantly undertaken by women?
- Did you know that pheromones given off by men experimenters, but not women, induce a stress response in laboratory mice sufficient to trigger pain relief?
- And did you know that climate change is affecting sex determination in a number of marine species and that certain populations are now at risk of extinction?

# Weaknesses: gender and open science

- The gender dimension **is not explored** in sufficiently specific detail, especially with reference to the proposed utilisation of xxx
- The gender dimension is not **convincingly addressed**, with the result that potential conflicts may be present in the data gathered.



# Supervision

- The qualifications and experience of the supervisor are **clearly described**.
- The supervisor is **highly qualified**, excellent project and publication track record in the topic and good hosting experience is evident.
- Both supervisor within the host institution are **leading experts** in their respective fields.
- The supervisory team has **experience of previous MSCA researchers**.
- **GF** - There is adequate supervision from experienced scholars, during outgoing phase as well as incoming phase.
- The proposal adequately **lists the staff who will provide support** in specific activities.



# **Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Guidelines on Supervision**

*Version: 1  
Date of release:  
12 April 2021*

# Weaknesses: supervision

- The **supervisors** research activities and publications related to the specific topic of the proposed research are limited.
- The researcher does not have sufficient experience in **supervising** research projects, which in turn does not convincingly demonstrate that **professional maturity** would be reached during the internship.
- The quality of the **supervision** is inadequately explained. For instance, the proposal does not sufficiently substantiate the expertise of the supervisor in the main reaction to be investigated. Also, it fails to clearly show the supervisor's level of experience in supervision at advanced level and international collaboration opportunities that the host could offer.
- The **experience of the supervisor** in mentoring researchers at postdoctoral level is not well documented in the proposal.
- Insufficient detail is given on the host's **experience of supervising** at advanced levels.




# Professional maturity

- How your existing professional experience, talents and the proposed research will **contribute to your development** as independent researcher during the fellowship?
- Clearly outlines the researcher's **background and potential** for acquiring new skills and knowledge
- ...has published a good number of **paperes**
- The reseracher has a **high motivation** and **promising profile**
- The researcher has a **very good CV for such stage of career development**.... These numbers are outstanding.
- The researcher has a **clear potential** in this field.

# What are the main challenges for applicants? - 2

## 2. Impact:

- Career development plan
- Quality of the proposed measures to **disseminate** and **exploit** (including IPR management) the project results
- Quality of the **communication** activities to different target audiences
- The extent to which the output of the project would contribute to each of **the expected impacts** (individual, institution, society)
- Description of **scientific, societal** and economic impacts



## Impact Section



# Impact criterion - PF

## Scientific impact

- Promote scientific excellence
- Support creation and diffusion of high-quality new fundamental and applied knowledge, skills and training

## Societal impact

- Generate knowledge
- Strengthen the impact of R&I in developing, supporting and implementing EU policies
- Support the uptake of innovative solutions in industry, notably in SMEs, and society to address global challenges

## Economic impact

- Foster all forms of innovation
- Facilitate technological development, demonstration and knowledge transfer
- Strengthen deployment of innovative solution

# Weaknesses: expected impacts

- No sufficiently **clear quantified estimates** on the magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impact are given.
- The potential of the proposal to bring appreciable societal and economic impacts **is not presented** in sufficiently convincing **detail**.
- The way, magnitude, and importance of this contribution are not made sufficiently **clear** in the proposal.
- The proposal does not properly address the expected **economic and societal impacts** of the work
- The claimed technological, economic and societal impacts are **generic and not convincingly discussed** in the proposal, e.g. there is a lack of quantitative indicators of the proposal contribution to the expected outcomes and potential impacts. Overall, the scale and the importance of these claimed impacts **are not sufficiently articulated** in the proposal.
- The proposal does not clearly describe what will be **the short- and long-term impact** of the work.

# Future Career Prospects

- The researcher's goals are **appropriately described**.
- New **academic contacts and networks** and additional **publications** would have a very important impact
- The future career prospects foresee an **ERC Starting Grant application** to be prepared and submitted during the fellowship which is relevant.
- The project gives resources to the researcher **to start her own project** at her home institute.
- ...is to establish his **own research group** at the hosting institution with the idea of creating a new research line.
- ...by improving the potential **for employability** in industry.
- ... would enhance the researcher's **international visibility** and improve the chances of success in **future job applications** in main universities.
- ...on the likelihood of receiving the **promotion of the researchers to associate professor** at the host institution.
- ...their main career development goals of **becoming a leading expert in their academic field**.

# Weaknesses: career perspectives

- *It is not clear whether the proposal will significantly contribute to the researcher's scientific skill development*
- *The measures for developing the researcher's expected skills being only very broadly mentioned, without sufficient details, are insufficiently credible for significantly enhancing the researcher's employability and career perspectives.*
- *The action is not sufficiently expected to have a significant impact on the development of these skills or in the employability as the researcher will return to their current position as Associated Professor.*
- *The planned measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher are too generic and almost exclusively oriented towards achieving an academic position as a group leader.*

- **Communication** is the promotion of the action by providing targeted information to multiple audiences (including the media and the public), in a strategic and effective manner and possibly engaging in a two-way exchange.
- **Dissemination** is sharing research results with potential users - peers in the research field, industry, other commercial players and policymakers. These results will feed into **exploitation** (using results for commercial purposes or in public policymaking).



# Dissemination of the project results

- ... is ambitious, with **well-defined outputs** and measures **clearly targeted at different groups**, including articles in practice magazines, practice manuals and guides, a workshop as well as journal papers to reach academic audiences.
- The **scientific publication** plans are detailed and ambitious, ensuring optimal scientific impact.
- The **number and range** of **dissemination activities** are comprehensively planned.
- The dissemination strategy is **convincingly described/detailed**.
- ...and to **relevant policy makers**.
- ... including **active collaborations**..
- to establish a **strong network with the Eu scientific community**.
- ... activities are included in the **Gantt chart**.

# Exploitation of the project results



- The potential **business exploitation** is foreseen and clearly described.
- ...interaction with the **Technology transfer office**
- ... describes well the potential **commercialisation** and patent application.
- The possibility of registering **patents** is considered
- The strategy for targeting **end-user associations** and other stakeholders is appropriate.
- The **commercialization** of the research is considered and the potential IP will be evaluated prior to the **publications**.
- IP and commercialization aspects will be thoroughly considered for protection by **patent** before publication.
- A well founded **IP protection process** is in place.
- Some of the results will be disseminated through an **open source** computation.

# Weaknesses: exploitation

- *Plans for dissemination of the results between industrial stakeholders are not well developed.*
- *Activities for commercial exploitation are not adequately planned.*
- *Insufficient information is given regarding the patent exploitation plan*
- *The proposal fails to describe a sufficiently defined and sound plan for protecting the intellectual property generated by the proposed research action.*
- *Strategies for the management of intellectual property rights and paths towards commercial exploitation are not clearly described.*



# Communication

- The **communication strategy** to address different **target audiences** is **detailed** and convincing.
- A detailed plan with **clear goals** for multiple outreach activities is outlined.
- The **host institution** demonstrates a **strong commitment** with the communication activities reaching a very large audience.
- It includes appropriate and **varied measures for public engagement** and for creating **awareness** of the research.
- The planned **engagement activities** will create a good awareness of the performed action.
- The communication strategy would adequately be **distributed throughout the duration** of the fellowship thus ensuring a constant interest about the research.
- It will use a **wide range of standard communication measures**.
- The use of **social media** networks is appropriate.
- A very good plan for **data management** and **open storage** is presented.



# EUROPEAN RESEARCHERS' NIGHT

30/09  
2022

**30/09  
2022**

# Weaknesses: communication

- *The communication strategy would adopt a narrow approach, that fails to utilise in full the diverse range of available media for achieving improved audience targeting and outreach effectiveness.*
- *The information regarding the channels for communication and public engagement activities lacks sufficient detail.*

# What are the main challenges for applicants? - 3

## 3. Implementation:

- Quality and effectiveness of the **work plan**, including extent to which the **resources** assigned to work packages are in line with their **objectives** and **deliverables**
- Appropriateness of the **allocation of tasks**
- Appropriateness of the **management structures** and procedures, including **risk management**



# The Work plan



- The work plan is **coherent** and aligned to the **main objectives**, and including both **training** and **research** goals.
- All the tasks in the **description** are relevant and oriented towards these goals.
- The WP are broken down into **clear steps** and **deliverables**.
- The sequence of the individual tasks is planned **reasonably and logically**.
- The estimated **time** for each WP appears in the Gantt chart.
- ... a **good balance** of research, teaching, and dissemination-related tasks, which are arranged in a **logical sequence**.
- The **interconnection** between the different WP is well described.

# Weaknesses: work plan

- *The allocation of efforts and timing are not well justified. For instance, the proposal fails to sufficiently substantiate the short time allocated to the respective work related to the application xxx*
- *The overall time allocated to the proposal is under-estimated taking into account the ambitious nature of the proposal and the numerous research tasks to be done. Important elements to monitor progress as milestones and deliverables are not logically planned in the Gantt chart.*
- *The proposal lacks information on important resources and efforts associated to the key tasks of the proposed work.*
- *The Gantt chart is very poorly presented and barely readable and it could not be assessed as such in regard to the whole work plan described in the proposal.*
- *The Gantt chart is not clearly presented. Some dissemination activities (for example, presentations at high schools) are not scheduled timely*
- *The work plan lacks a clear enough organization. The time allocation and the task description lack explanations.*
- *Milestones and deliverables are not sufficiently described. For example, deliverables are limited to reports but their specific content and goals are not clear.*
- *The description of deliverables is minimal. Milestones are poorly defined and not well measurable.*
- *The proposed secondment was not sufficiently considered in the work-plan*

# The Gantt chart



- The Gantt chart includes the **timeline distribution of all tasks**.
- There is a **clear Gantt chart** and with the **proper overlap between the WP**.
- The proposed tasks in the Gantt chart are well-linked to a set of specific and tangible **outcomes**.
- The proposal includes a schematic overview in the form of a Gantt chart, as well as a **narrative providing clear information**, together presenting a coherent and effective work plan with WP, deliverables and milestones.
- The related graph and the Gantt chart appropriately **complement the description of the work plan**.

# The allocation of tasks and resources



- The **allocation of tasks and resources** is appropriate for the implementation of the project.
- The feasibility of the project, and the **person month** relation is appropriate for the action.
- The **time allocated to specific tasks** is appropriate to reach the milestones proposed.

# Risk analysis



- The main **scientific risks** are identified and credible **mitigation strategies** are proposed.
- **Risk analysis** covers research and administrative risks.
- Risk management is addressed by making the work packages independent such that no package is endangered by the (partial) failure of another.
- ... well thought out **alternative strategies and solutions proposed**, including management of time.
- An **assessment of potential scientific bottlenecks** is described in the proposal and their **contingency plans** are briefly delineated.
- Risk assessment has sufficiently identified potential limitations of the techniques to be used.

# Weaknesses: risk management

- A specific and **detailed risks mitigation plan** for supporting the seamless implementation of the proposed research action is missing in the proposal. The **administrative risks** are not considered at the necessary level of detail either.
- **The risk management plan** is not sufficiently comprehensive, as it mainly tackles **technical risks** related to poor material performance. It lacks the depth required to address key **risks in the experimental plan**, in particular possible limitations of the characterization techniques. Potential **administrative risks** and the associated contingency plans are not adequately addressed.
- - The proposal does not fully consider a **number of potential risks**. In particular the success of almost all project activities will depend on very large computational operations; the **risk contingency plan** on this issue is not discussed enough in the proposal.
- The proposal does not present a sufficiently clear assessment of **experimental risks**.
- The **mitigation actions are not realistically analysed** considering challenging goals and risks of the proposed work.

# Support services by the host

- The **administrative arrangements and support** for hosting the researcher are presented.
- The researcher would have **constant and multi-dimensional support**, including administrative and financial management.
- The **active contribution** of the hosting institution to the research and training activities is clear.



# Institutional environment



- The active contribution of the beneficiary to the research and training activities should be described.
- Give a description of the main tasks and commitments of the beneficiary and all partner organisations.
- **Describe the infrastructure**, logistics, facilities offered in sofar as they are necessary for the good implementation of the action.



# Research infrastructure

- The host institution has a **good/suitable infrastructure** for the research work proposed.
- The infrastructure **is well matched with the proposal needs** and suitable for the execution of the project.
- ...suitable for the good implementation.
- ... excellent scientific infrastructure.
- The **description of infrastructures**, logistics and facilities of the host institutions as well of the secondments institutions is likely **to enable the project to achieve its objectives**.
- ... offer **adequate levels** of institutional, infrustruce and administrative support.
- ...have **capacities and the experience** to welcome and train students and researchers to a high level..
- Institutional environment is **of good quality**, including research facilities, office spaces, storage and computational capacity, and **meets required standards** for supporting the researcher in their tasks.



# Management - 1

- Scientific **progress monitoring** mechanisms are based on intensive **reporting and regular meetings** with supervisor and team members.
- State of the art research proposal management and **permanent monitoring procedures** are in place at the host, with **responsibilities** clearly defined.
- **Monitoring strategy:** research meeting, mentor supervision, periodic presentation at the institutional level together with the appointment of a **formal advisory committee** of experts to advise on implementation of the project.
- The researcher plans to **meet the supervisor by-weekly** to create a work log and set up a **staff committee** to monitor and assess the researcher's progress.
- The proposal benefits from the researcher's **connections to senior academics**.
- The project management includes **weekly group meetings, day-to-day** scientific supervision from the supervisor as well as **documenting** all the activities within a GA.



# Management - 2

- The researcher will have enough **support from the host institution**.
- The project will be monitored **on regular basis via presentations to the whole host organisation** that will secure reaching the proposed objectives.
- Management structure; a highly qualified **management committee**, as well as an **external advisory board** composed by international experts
- **Weekly meeting** between the researcher and the supervisor, and **monthly meetings** with other scientists of the host institution.
- ...based on **ISO quality assurance**...suitable **administrative support**.
- ... as well as **reevaluation of the project results on a monthly basis**
- **Scientific integrity issues** are well addressed.
- **GF:** The management structure is adequate for both the outgoing and return phases.
- The progress monitoring mechanisms to meet the requirements of the objectives rely on well-established **routines and standards at the host institutions**.



## CORDIS is the primary source of results from EU-funded projects since 1990

- [List projects by framework](#)
- [See latest results](#)
- [Download projects as open data](#)
- [Visualise Horizon 2020 data](#)



Search projects and results

- Projects
- Project acronym
- Project ID
- Results
- All results
- Results in Brief
- Report Summaries
- Project Deliverables
- Project Publications

### Latest updated projects

Acronym	Title	ID	Last update
LOLABAT	Long LAsting BATtery System	963576	8 December 2020
HyShip	DEMONSTRATING LIQUID HYDROGEN FOR THE MARITIME SECTOR	101007205	8 December 2020
LIGHT-CAP	MULTI-ELECTRON PROCESSES FOR LIGHT DRIVEN ELECTRODES AND ELECTROLYTES IN CONVERSION AND STORAGE OF SOLAR ENERGY	101017821	8 December 2020
EuropeWave	Bridging the gap to commercialisation of wave energy technology using pre-commercial procurement	883751	8 December 2020

HORIZON  
2020

# Migrant legal STATUS diversity and diversity dynamics in European CITIES

Fact Sheet

Results in Brief

Reporting

Results

## Objective

StatusCities will provide a comprehensive investigation of the city level implications of migrants being differentiated by a myriad of legal status tracks. Conceptually and empirically focussing on superdiversity and diversity dynamics – rather than cross-sectional configurations - the specific aim is to link debates about the national level management of migration with debates on urban migration-related diversities. This is extremely timely given unprecedented migration to Europe and especially to Europe's cities. Asking where migrants subject to different legal status conditions live and what their residential biographies look like, StatusCities will combine an analysis of both unique longitudinal register data and qualitative data derived through mobile-phone supported long term elicitation techniques. The former will be used to map and visualise migrant residential patterns in light of status differentiations, the latter to analyse city and neighbourhood level patterns by paying attention to individual mobility and sociality decisions at the time of legal status transitions. The project will be focused on four urban centres located in one of Europe's major conurbations the Dutch Randstad. The research will consider multiple scales of analysis through a focus on different types and differently sized cities and within them neighbourhoods that show a relatively high turnover of different status migrants. StatusCities will thus contribute knowledge and methodological innovation by drawing on debates from various disciplinary fields and using a sophisticated and innovative mixed methods approach. Research has not yet investigated how the multiplicity of status differences - with their associated eligibility criteria and the parameters of presence that they set out - are relevant to dynamic changes in migration-related diversity. With the current levels of migration StatusCities is devoted to filling this highly policy relevant knowledge void.

## Fields of science

[social sciences](#) > [sociology](#) > [demography](#) > [human migrations](#)[natural sciences](#) > [computer and information sciences](#) > [data science](#) > [big data](#)

S. Soričan, NCP MSCA Slovenia, 2022

## Project Information

**StatusCities**

Grant agreement ID: 707124

**Closed project****Start date**

1 September 2017

**End date**

31 August 2019

**Funded under**

H2020-EU.1.3.2.

**Overall budget**

€ 165 598,80

**EU contribution**

€ 165 598,80

**Coordinated by**

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITEIT DELFT

**This project is featured in...**

# Key links and references

## MSCA

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Website [https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/node\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/node_en)

Funding and Tenders Portal (applications, documents, partner search) <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/programmes/horizon>

Euraxess (PhD and postdoctoral vacancies, more information) <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/>

National Contact Points <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/support/ncp>

Research Enquiry Service [https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/contact/research-enquiry-service-and-participant-validation\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/contact/research-enquiry-service-and-participant-validation_en)

European Charter and Code for Researchers <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter-code-researchers>

MSCA Guidelines on Supervision <https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/about-msca/msca-guidelines-on-supervision>

MSCA Green Charter <https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/green-charter>

MCAA (Marie Curie Alumni association) <https://www.mariecuriealumni.eu>

Become an Expert <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/work-as-an-expert>

CORDIS:<https://cordis.europa.eu/search?q=%2Fproject%2Frelations%2Fcategories%2FprojectFundingSchemeCategory%2Fcode%3D%27MSCA%27&p=1&num=10&srt=Relevance:decreasing>

## EURATOM

Euratom Treaty: [THE EURATOM TREATYCONSOLIDATED VERSION \(europa.eu\)](#)

Euratom Research & Training programme 2021-2025: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.LI.2021.167.01.0081.01.ENG>

EURATOM Work Programme 2021-2022: [wp\\_euratom-2021-2022\\_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](wp_euratom-2021-2022_en.pdf (europa.eu))  
S. Sorcan, NCP MSCA Slovenia, 2022

# Najlepša hvala za pozornost!

[stojan.sorcan@gov.si](mailto:stojan.sorcan@gov.si)



REPUBLIKA SLOVENIJA  
**MINISTRSTVO ZA IZOBRAŽEVANJE,  
ZNANOST IN ŠPORT**