



*Marie Sklodowska Curie Actions-  
Individual Fellowships info day  
May 13th 2019*

*Goiuri Alberdi  
@goiurialberdi*



## *The Role of European National Health Services in the Enhancement of Sustainable Food systems*

- Unsustainable food systems
  - Environmental degradation
  - Diet related diseases
  - Inequalities
- Health care systems: Main drivers for societal changes. Capacity to change the *Status Quo* towards sustainable means.
- **Objective:** Explore the food system processes related with the economic and educative channels of the European health services from a sustainable dimension and to develop the first System of Indicators that will aid up in the decision making of those processes.



*(may not be the most exemplary case...)*

- Time to write up the proposal. Hard core: June-September 12 hours day, no weekends.
- Two things were paramount:
  - We believed deeply on the research idea.
  - My supervisor has been hand-in-hand with me during the whole process.
- Proposal reviewed by supervisor and University services.

## *The strenght / quality of your project*

- Strong rationale: well formulated and credible research.
  - Relevant and original.
  - Topic: **high societal, environmental, and economic significance**
- IMPACT!! H2020 is looking for projects economically viable with real added value! +++ references online.**
- Literature research: very **well documented** in discussing relevant aspects in relation to the state-of-the-art. Describe **existing knowledge gaps** and identify leading edge research.
    - Include current policies:  
“The need for a sustainable food system is **highlighted within various EC strategies** (e.g. DG Sante ´s strategic plan 2016-2020) and is prioritised across Horizon 2020 programmes such as Societal Challenges, 1, 2, 5 and 6”.
    - Include specific data that can be measurable for the impact of your work. # hospital beds in Europe. SDGs that will be affected by project.

## *The strenght / quality of your project*

A well formulated and credible research, structured around a theme of **high societal, environmental, and economic significance**

The proposal is very **well documented** in discussing relevant aspects in relation to the state-of-the-art.

Relevant **state-of-the-art is well described** and **existing knowledge gaps** and leading edge research are identified.

Overview is very good, and the **overarching aim is highly relevant and original**; specific objectives are clearly defined and relevant.

★ **There is a certain risk consisting in the fact that some objectives are too ambitious, in particular in relation to transforming the European health system.**

2017: The collaborative knowledge creation process (co-generation) is predicted to empower the stakeholders, **adding real options of transformation** of public policies.

2018: The collaborative knowledge creation process (co-generation) will empower the stakeholders, **facilitating the transition** from fundamental research to applied projects

## *Robust methodologic approach*

The research methodology and approach based on qualitative research methods using **participative action research** is sound and very well suited for the research project.

The proposal demonstrates sufficiently that it is **original** and contains a number of **innovative aspects**.

The combination of several approaches and development of a novel evaluation framework and system of indicators are innovative aspects

- ★ Some details of the research methodology are not sufficiently described and are unclear such that credibility of research methodology cannot be assessed.
- ★ Evaluation of environmental impacts is insufficiently described and the proposal does not adequately justify the practical validation restricted to hospitals.

## *Interdisciplinarity in research*

There is a very well conceived exposure to intersectorial environments through non-academic subjects involved in the research.

Interdisciplinary and intersectoral aspects are clearly described and very well considered. Unique interdisciplinarity will use a collaborative knowledge creation process to empower stakeholders involved in the research.

We are economist related with bussiness development, agroecology and me a nutritionist with experience in public health

## Gender criteria

*Gender aspects are very well considered at different stages of the research.*

*The gender dimension in research content is well addressed.*

- *Explain how you are going to include it in your project. Be specific.*

“The qualitative nature of the study will allow the use of “observation” as a tool to **transversally analyse** the gender dimension through the project execution. (...) i will consider the gender aspect in the Sistem of Indicators that i am going to develop (i.e. what is the role of the women in the decision making of food system processes in hospitals). (...) and following the **equality strategy of Horizon 2020**, a target of 40% of the under-represented sex will be set within the stakeholder group and panel of experts.”

**Add where is relevant! If it is not relevant SAY it! Give a reason.**

# Training

*Paramount point of the proposal:*

- *Define well your training in accordance to knowledge and skill gaps: What, when, where, how.*
- *Define well how is the Transfer of Knowledge going to be.*
- **BE REALISTIC!**
- *How is your training going to improve your researcher profile and improve your career perspectives. GIVE examples!*

# Training

*The training objectives for the researcher are very well defined in accordance to knowledge and skill gaps including the well suited training at the secondment institution.*

★ *The transfer of some of the researchers' skills, in particular of some newly acquired skills, to the host institution is not clearly demonstrated.*

*DO NOT OVER DO IT! Keep it real!*

*Training activities are very focused, well considered and relevant. Training-through-research activities with host participation are very appropriate for the researcher to achieve new skills. The training plan sufficiently includes a special course related to the gender dimension of the proposed research.*

*Potential for two-way transfer of knowledge between researcher and host institution is very high which will benefit both host and researcher. Ways proposed to facilitate this knowledge transfer are credible.*

*New competences and skills to be acquired during the fellowship are highly relevant and well considered for strengthening the researcher's profile.*

# Supervision

*The proposal demonstrates that the supervision and hosting arrangements are of good quality. Overall, the research experience and achievements of the supervisors involved in the training program are good and strictly related to the proposed topic.*

★ *The proposal fails to adequately describe the **experience of the supervisors in managing European projects.***

*Qualifications and experience of the supervisors are comprehensively documented and very appropriate for the proposed field of research and training.*

## *Hosting arrangements*

*The integration of the researcher in the research group/team at both hosts is very well demonstrated.*

*Hosting arrangements are detailed and appropriate. The host group is of high quality and provides a very good research environment for the project. **Opportunities for international networking are clearly identified** and integration of the researcher in the social, economic, commercial and entrepreneurial activities of the host institution is well addressed.*

## *Researchers CV and track for independence*

*The proposal and CV of the researcher demonstrate in a very good way that the researcher is highly qualified and motivated to take on this research. The researcher has meaningful publications in highly impacted journals and a very good record on conference participation. A career development strategy is carefully considered.*

*Researcher's good track record is clearly demonstrated and researcher's professional experience and skills provide a solid basis for further development as an independent professional.*

CV is not punctuated, but you have to explain it well (and sell it well) so they can see your potential to become an independent researcher.

## *Enhancement of Future career*

- Link your “old” skills and the newly gathered ones → new opportunities to develop your career.

*“I will be in a unique position, as nutritionist working in sustainable food system policy related research and sustainable public health nutrition, within a multidisciplinary group.”*

- Explain with specific examples how this fellowship will enhance your work opportunities in academy and outside!

### **KEEP IT REAL BUT DON´T BE SHY!**

- RamonYCajal
- Further funding opportunities
- Skills for consultancy
- Potential ideas for Spinning out of the Institution...

**Academic and  
Non-academic!**

## *Enhancement of Future career*

*The proposal demonstrates very well how the fellowship would enhance the future career of the researcher both as an academic and as a consultant. The research program would strongly enhance career perspectives and employability of the researcher.*

*Added value of the proposed training and research is well described. Existing expertise and the new skills and competencies to be acquired will place the researcher in a unique position in a field with increasing societal relevance. Fellowship will significantly enhance researcher's future career prospects.*

## Dissemination and Communication

*The plan for the dissemination of the action results is comprehensive. The proposal describes in a very good way how the results of the project would be disseminated and exploited to have the necessary impact.*

*The dissemination strategy towards a scientific and specialized public (e.g. science community, policy makers, stakeholders) is very well based on diversified and feasible actions. Timing is conveniently considered. Tools and channels to be used are properly tackled.*

*Dissemination plan for the results to scientific and expert communities is detailed.*

★ *Expected results and impact of the many planned dissemination activities are not clearly specified.*

*Planned engagement of the host institution in exploitation of the results is a very well considered.*

★ *Described exploitation of the project results is generic and does not account for the full potential of the results.*

## *Dissemination and Communication*

### **Differentiate: Communication, Outreach, Dissemination, Exploitation.**

- “Gold” Open Access.
- Development of a Data Management Plan (DMP) to enable FAIR data (findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable)
- Use of Repositories.
- Name the specific the journals you will target.
- Name the specific conference you want to assist.
- Name your previous experiences in communication and outreach (if any): Newspaper appearance, interview...
- Use resources from the EU website:

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/index_en.htm)

**BE SPECIFIC. GIVE REAL EXAMPLES OF DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION!!**

## *Intellectual Property*

*2017: The intellectual property right issues are only briefly outlined; the strategy how to protect results is not sufficiently described.*

“The Intellectual property rights will be owned by UPV/EHU. “

*2018: Handling of intellectual property rights is not sufficiently described.*

“The Host organisation also has very well-defined Codes of Practice and Policies on Intellectual and Knowledge transfer, aligned with EC recommendations.”

**Mind this! They take it very seriously! I don't have the best examples.**

## *Work-Plan and Task Allocation*

*The workplan is well structured and realistic, with a number of coherent and well balanced work packages, and clear definitions of tasks, deliverables, and milestones. The objectives of the work-packages are discussed in a good manner and correspond well to the stated project's objectives.*

*Work packages defined in the work plan are coherent with the proposed research, training and outreach and well matched with research objectives. Gantt chart is clear and covers all planned activities, major tasks, deliverables and secondment.*

## Work-Plan and Task Allocation

*The major deliverables and milestones are appropriately distributed along the project lifecycle and well presented in the Gantt chart.*

*Allocation of tasks is very clear and precisely specified.*

★ *Details of some of the activities are not sufficiently described, such as the potential overlapping of activities between WP1-WP4, and the timing of secondments in the Gantt chart.*

*Proposal provides a clear overview of resources allocated to work packages and deliverables to be produced. Number of person-months allocated to work packages is appropriate in relation to proposed activities.*

★ *Milestones are all associated with the end of work packages and insufficiently safeguard progress within work packages.*

*Indicators by which to monitor project progress are not sufficiently described.*

Explain each WP, the tasks involves and the deliverables associated, and milestones.  
Explain the time allocation (with arguments)

Add Work-Packages for:

- Project Management
- PEDR
- Training

**2017:**

**WP1- Theoretical generation of SOI:** The aim is to set the initial context situation and to establish the objectives that will guide the decision making on food system processes from a sustainability dimension in the health-care services. These objectives will then be used to define the Principles, Criteria, & Indicators of the system. It is expected that this part of the project will give way to an article. **Tasks:** T. 1.1.: Literature review (scientific publications & grey literature) and active on-site observation; T. 1.2.: Focus group; T. 1.3.: Set objectives and commence the PC & I process. **Deliverables:** D. 1.1.: First draft of SOI; D. 1.2.: Manuscript - Review on food policies of health services in Europe. **Milestones:** M. 1.1.: Finalised the first draft of SOI.

**2018:**

**WP1 [M1-M10]- Theoretical generation of SOI:** To set the initial context, develop objectives and generate the SOI using the PC&I theory. **Tasks:** T. 1.1.: Literature systematic review; T. 1.2.: Focus group; T. 1.3.: Set objectives and the PC&I process. **Deliverables:** D. 1.1.: Manuscript - Systematic review on food policies of health services in Europe; D. 1.2.: First draft of SOI. **Milestones:** M. 1.1.: Finalise the first draft of SOI. WP1 is expected to be conducted smoothly within the allocated time. It is a priority to obtain the necessary literature, team discussions and appropriate focus group to achieve the core conceptual framework that will drive the SOI design. We find from previous experiences that 8 months is enough to prepare protocol and carry out the review steps (search, eligibility & validity assessment, data collection & entry, analysis & preparation of report). An additional month is needed to carry out a focus group and another month to the set objectives and finalise the draft. Therefore, a 10-month period is enough to discuss, reach consensus and finish the WP1 deliverables, before progressing to WP2.

## *Project Management and Contingency planning*

*The proposal addresses the management structure and procedures in a very good way. Risk assessment is adequately addressed and the project will rely on well-conceived monitoring and risk management strategies. For the latter, appropriate mitigation strategies are clearly demonstrated.*

★ *- the contingency planning is not satisfactorily taken into account.*

*Organization of the project and its management structure are appropriately planned.*

*Risk analysis is very comprehensive and covers research and administrative risks. The contingency plan is very well addressed.*

WP	Risk	Contingency plan
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Difficulty obtaining the literature for the systematic review.</li> <li>-Language barrier as many policies will be written in the official language of each European country.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-We will be persistent with the source of information to obtain the literature required. However, if impossible, as in any review, we will highlight the missing information.</li> <li>-The language barriers are lessened nowadays, with many devices that can help clarify the information.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poor identification of stakeholders.</li> <li>-Poor engagement of stakeholders. European stakeholders are sought for this DELPHI; the physical distance might hinder their engagement, with low response and lack of consensus.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The identification issue should be solved with a thorough context setting in WP1.</li> <li>-We will use our network with the JRC in green economy and innovation and the network of supervisors (see page 3) to aid us in the identification and engagement of stakeholders.</li> <li>-In the information package and consent forms we shall underline the importance of their commitment once they accept to participate in the project.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The busy agendas of the panel of experts may hinder the consecution of a face-to-face focus group.</li> <li>-Difficulty to have everyone together within the panel.</li> <li>-Low engagement level of the panel of experts.</li> <li>-High expenses required for a face-to-face panel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-We shall start recruiting the experts during WP1; ahead of time to fit in their agendas.</li> <li>-Subsequent panels could be carried out by other means (i.e. Skype).</li> <li>-Alternatively, as last resort, we will permit one individual session if required by any expert.</li> <li>-A face-to-face session will strengthen the engagement.</li> <li>-They will sign an agreement of responsibility, to reinforce their commitment to the study.</li> <li>-The use of international events/conferences related with sustainability, food system or policy making, could be a useful meeting point and may reduce expenses.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Poor engagement of the health institutions for the practical validation of the SOL.</li> <li>-Respondent bias: Those already proactive in sustainability may be more inclined to participate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Hospitals will sign an agreement of responsibility, to reinforce their commitment to the study.</li> <li>-The use purposive sampling for participant selection will minimise the risk of bias and guarantees the inclusion of a whole spectrum of cases, including extreme ones.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-A lack of interest from main Basque actors to participate in the Strategy Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-An intense promotion of the project should increase their interest and commitment, with one-to-one meetings, discussion seminar invitations and using the well-established</li> </ul>

**WP6- Project management:** This WP is dedicated to management of the project and fellowship. The **Initiation meeting** will arrange the details to commence the project and a CDP will be designed. Weekly monitoring meetings with supervisors of HI will ensure the progress of the project is within the triple constraint (budget, scope, time) and potential risks and contingency plans will be assessed. Every 6-months a review stage will be carried out. **To close the project**, results will be sent to every participant of the project, as well as finalise any open activities. This WP will have a management master file with minutes of meetings, progress and feedback reports, agreements, consent forms, etc. that will neatly show the evolution of the project. **Tasks:** **T. 6.1.:** Project Initiation meeting; **T. 6.2.:** Monitoring meetings; **T. 6.3.:** Closure of project. **Deliverables:** **D.6.1.:** CDP; **D. 6.2.:** Management Master file; **D.6.3.:** Reports for the European Commission. **Milestones:** **M. 6.1.:** Closure of project. WP6 runs throughout the whole project, and we leave the last 2 months of the project to close it up adequately.

## *Host Institution appropriateness*

*The proposal describes in a sufficient way that the host organisation will actively contribute to the advancement of the researcher by providing all necessary documentation, contracts and facilities.*

*Active contribution to main tasks and commitment of the host institution is clearly evident.*

*The competence and experience of both beneficiary and partner institutions are very relevant for the achievement of the research objectives.*

*Infrastructure, logistics, and facilities of the host institution and partners are of a very high level for proposed research and training activities.*

## *The main points for a successful proposal*

- Strong project: With a clear impact of the results.
- Use real examples.
- Multidisciplinarity/interdisciplinarity
- Use the help-resources: Read the EU's work-Programs, strategies...Identify what EU needs, identify key words to use in your proposal (i.e. RRI, multidisciplinarity, DMP, societal impact...).
- Explain HOW this fellowship will help in improving your career opportunities.
- Write up a strong overview of the project: Why bother? (what problem are you trying to solve?); Is it a European priority? Could it be solved at National Level?; Is the solution already available (product,service, transfer)?; Why now? (what would happen if we did not do this now?); Why you? (are you the best people to do this job?)
- Hard work.
- Supervisor back-up.

- Be clear
- Concise
- Specific
- Do not divagate



renascence

*DON'T GIVE UP!*

*It is possible to  
get it!!!*

